Fourth Series, Vol.II, No. 5

Wednesday, April 5, 1967
Chaitra 15, 1889 (Saka)

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(First Session)

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY
No. 4(7) 3
Dt. 12.82

(Vol. II contains Nos. 1 to 10)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price : Rs. 2. 00

CONTENTS

No. 14—*Wednesday, April,* 5, 1967/*Chaitra* 15, 1889 (*Saka*)

	COLUMNS
Oral Answers to Questions—	
*Starred Questions Nos. 259 to 262	2779—2813
Short Notice Question No. 6	2813—16
Written Answers to Questions—	
Starred Questions Nos. 263 to 278, 278A, 279 to 282, 282A, 283 to 288 and 288A	2816—36
Unstarred Questions Nos. 510 to 538, 540 to 587, 589 to 620, 620A, 620B, 620C, and 620D	2836—2907
Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance—	
India's Participation in Secret Seminar on Asian Defence held in New Delhi recently with several NATO and SEATO Member States	2907—14
Motion of Privilege *re.* Mrs. Svetlana Allelueva Affair	2914—3001
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia	2916, 2920—29, 2985—93
Shri M. R. Masani	2918, 2943—45
Shri Bal Raj Madhok	2945—46
Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji	2946—50
Shri Dattatraya Kunte	2950—51
Shri K. Narayana Rao	2951—52
Shri Nath Pai	2952—57
Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha	2957—63
Shri A. B. Vajpayee	2963—65
Shri H. N. Mukerjee	2965—67
Shri Madhu Limaye	2967—69
Shri Sheo Narain	2969—70
Shri Umanath	2970—72
Shri Dinesh Singh	2972—73
Shri M. C. Chagla	2973—85
Papers Laid on the Table	3001—04
Motion of Thanks on the President's Address	3004—25
Shrimati Indira Gandhi	3004—21
Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill	3026—3040
Motion to Consider	3026—
Shri Govinda Menon	3026

*The sign + marked above the name of a Member indicates that the question was actually asked on the floor of the House by that Member.

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, April 5, 1967/Chaitra 15, 1889 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Conversion of the Official Residence of the Late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru at New Delhi into a Museum

*259. **Shri George Fernandes:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the amount so far spent on converting the former official residence of the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaher Lal Nehru at New Delhi into a Museum;

(b) whether Government have any proposal to abandon the idea of converting the late Prime Minister's residence into a Museum in view of the high cost involved;

(c) whether any suggestion was made from any quarter to have a similar museum in respect of another late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri; and

(d) if so, the decision taken thereon?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Prof. Sher Singh): (a) About Rs. 55,000 so far.

(b) and (c). There are no such proposals at present.

(d) Does not arise.

श्री जार्ज फरनेण्डिस : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कई दिनों से अखबारों में यह खबरें आई हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान की वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी फिर उसी मकान में जाना चाहती हैं, जिसको आज नेहरू स्मारक म्यूजियम बनाया गया है और जो म्यूजियम वहां पर इस वक्त रखा गया है उसको वहां से हटाने का भी कुछ विचार चल रहा है,—क्या मंत्री साहब इसका खुलासा करेंगे ?

प्रो० शेर सिंह : ये सब कयास-आराइयां हैं। अखबारों में कयास-आराइयां चलती ही रहती हैं।

श्री जार्ज फरनेण्डिस : मेरा दूसरा प्रश्न यह है कि क्या मंत्री साहब इस बात की सफाई करेंगे कि तीन मूर्ति के मकान में जो नेहरू स्मारक म्यूजियम करके रखा गया है उस म्यूजियम को वहां से नहीं हटाया जायगा और वहां पर भारत का कोई नया प्रधान मंत्री फिर रहने के लिये नहीं जायगा ?

प्रो० शेर सिंह : भविष्य के बारे में आज नहीं कहा जा सकता, भविष्य की बात तो भविष्य में सामने आयेगी।

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : क्या सरकार ने इस बात पर विचार किया है कि दिल्ली में नेहरू विश्वविद्यालय नाम से एक विश्वविद्यालय खोला गया है— इस दृष्टि से यह उचित होगा कि श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू के सम्बन्ध में जितनी चीजें तीन मूर्ति में हैं, उनको वहां से इस विश्वविद्यालय में स्थानान्तरित कर दिया जाय, जिससे देश तथा विदेश से शोध करने आनेवालों को सुविधा हो सके ?

प्रो० शेर सिंह : यह युनीवर्सिटी भी दिल्ली में है और यह म्यूजियम भी दिल्ली में है, इसलिये शोध कार्य करनेवालों के लिये यदि आवश्यक होगा, तो इस सुझाव पर भी विचार किया जा सकता है। लेकिन अभी इस पर कोई विचार नहीं किया गया है।

Shri P. K. Deo: In view of the acute shortage of accomodation in the capital, may I know how long this luxury will continue of leaving these big bungalows vacant and not arriving at a decision? We know that on the bungalow occupied by the late Lal Bahadur Shastri nearly Rs. 10 lakhs were spent on remodelling and it is still lying vacant.

Prof. Sher Singh: It is not lying vacant. The museum and the library are housed in the Teen Murti Marg building.

Shri P. K. Deo: I am asking regarding the official residence at 10 Janpath of the late lamented Lal Bahadur Shastri.

Mr. Speaker: But this question is about the Teen Murti Marg house.

Shri P. K. Deo: My question comes under part (c).

Prof. Sher Singh: In reply to part (c) of the main question, I have replied that there is no such proposal.

Shri P. K. Deo: It is a very intelligent supplementary and if the hon. Minister cannot answer such a question, we feel helpless.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: Is there any proposal to have additional constructions at the backyard of the Teen Murti Marg house so that it can be used both for the Prime Minister's residence as well as for the museum?

Prof. Sher Singh: There is a proposal for constructing a building for the library because the present building is not sufficient for the national library which is proposed to be set up. Therefore, Rs. 18 lakhs have been provided for constructing a building for the library in the Teen Murti premises.

Shri Virendrakumar Shah: Will the Government not consider it advisable to set a tradition that the Prime Minister's official residence once acquired should not be changed every time and from that point of view the Prime Minister should move into Teen Murti Marg?

Prof. Sher Singh: It is a good suggestion and will be kept in view.

श्री शिव नारायण : इस तीन मूर्ति में काफी स्थान है । मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि यह जो म्यूजियम है यह नेहरू जी के नाम पर कायम किया गया है, क्यों न उसको एक्सटेण्ड कर के यूनीवर्सिटी का हिस्सा बना दिया जाय । जवाहरलाल नेहरू यूनिवर्सिटी जो बन रही है, उसमें इसको भी एक्सटेण्ड कर दिया जाय, ताकि रिसर्च करने वालों को आसानी हो जाय ?

प्रो० शेर सिंह : इस बात पर विचार किया जा सकता है ।

Shri G. Viswanathan: There are newspaper reports that the Prime Minister is faced with the house problem. Is there any proposal for the Prime Minister to move into the Teen Murti House?

Prof. Sher Singh: There is no such problem before the Prime Minister. It is not yet decided whether she will move into that house or not.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : क्या आप उनको वहां जाने की सलाह देंगे ?

Shri Indrajit Gupta: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member's question was as to whether there is a proposal for her to shift to that house. The Minister says that no decision has yet been taken. The question was as to whether there is any such proposal?

Prof. Sher Singh: I had already replied that there is no such proposal.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : क्या माननीय मंत्री इस प्रपोजल पर विचार करेंगे कि प्रधान मंत्री के लिये इतना बड़ा मकान नहीं चाहिये । जैसा गांधी जी ने कहा था—उनके लिये एक छोटा मकान होना चाहिए ।

प्रो० शेर सिंह : ऐसी कोई प्रपोजल नहीं आई है । यह आपकी सजेशन है ।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : क्या इस पर विचार करेंगे । मैं अपने प्रश्न को फिर से, अध्यक्ष महोदय, स्पष्ट कर दूं । क्या सरकार इस पर विचार करेगी कि प्रधान मंत्री का जो निवास-स्थान है, वह बहुत बड़ा नहीं होना चाहिये, जैसा गांधी जी ने कहा था—छोटा होना चाहिये ।

प्रो० शेर सिंह इस समय प्रधान मंत्री बहुत छोटे मकान में रह रही हैं, वह बड़ा मकान नहीं है ।

श्री मधु लिमये . इस समय की बात नहीं है । आगे की बात बताइये ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : उन्होंने कितने बड़े मकान को छोटा बना दिया है .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I will not allow this shouting. Mr. Kachhavaiya, you cannot get up like this and shout. You can ask a question but not shout like this.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने कहा था कि उन्होंने कितने बड़े मकान को छोटा बना दिया ।

Mr. Speaker: I do not think the hon. Minister need reply to this.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: Will the hon. Minister enlighten us whether, sometime ago, when Pandit Nehru was alive, he was thinking of having the Prime Minister's house constructed in the compound of the Teen Murti House? That has not been answered by the Minister.

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): How can the Ministry of Education answer this?

श्री राजनेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डिस के प्रश्न का उत्तर देते हुए मंत्री महोदय ने कहा कि ये कयास-आराइया हैं । मैं चाहूंगा कि इन कयास-आराइयों का अन्त हो जाय । ये खबरें छपती रहती हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री तीन मूर्ति या कहीं और रहना चाहती हैं । मैं चाहता हूं कि आप निश्चित रूप से कहें कि प्रधान मंत्री जहां रह रही हैं, वहीं रहेंगी और कहीं नहीं जायेंगी ।

An Hon. Member: On a point of order, Sir . . . (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

श्री मधु लिमये . अध्यक्ष महोदय, इसके बारे में सफाई होनी चाहिये । दिल्ली शहर को तो समाधियों और प्रधान मंत्रियों के निवास स्थानों में बांट दिया जा रहा है । कुछ घर प्रधान मंत्रीयों के निवास स्थान बन गये हैं और कुछ जगहों पर समाधियां बन गई हैं, जैसे मोहनजोदारो है, वैसा ह दिल्ली बन रहा है । मैं चाहता हूं कि कोई कानून बना कर एक अलग जगह उनके लिये निश्चित की जाय ।

Guiding Principles for Governors to form Government

*269. **Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta:**
Shri A. Sreedharan:
Shri P. K. Deo:
Shri G. C. Naik:
Shri K. P. Singh Deo:
Shri Dipa:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have laid down any principles for the guidance of the Governors for inviting the leaders of parties to form Government in the States; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या मंत्री महोदय बतायेंगे कि जब किसी प्रदेश की स्थिति साफ नहीं होती है और दो पार्टियों का बराबर बराबर मत होता है, उस समय कन्फ्यूजन न हो, इस दृष्टि से कोई निश्चित प्रोसीजर तय करने पर सरकार

गौर करेंगी और क्या सरकार ने इस पर विचार किया है ? यदि किया है, तो वह क्या है ?

श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल : हमारे राज्यों के जो गवर्नर होते हैं, वे काफ़ी जिम्मेदार व्यक्ति होते हैं . . . . (व्यवधान) . . . इसलिये अब तक कोई आवश्यकता महसूस नहीं हुई कि उन्हें किसी तरह का कोई डाइरेक्शन या निर्देश दिया जाय । यदि ऐसी कोई आवश्यकता हुई तो उस पर अवश्य विचार किया जायगा ।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : क्या मंत्री महोदय बतायेंगे कि राजस्थान के गवर्नर महोदय ने केन्द्रीय सरकार से वहां पर मिनिस्ट्री फौरमेशन के बारे में क्या क्या परामर्श किये, और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसके क्या क्या जवाब दिये ?

श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल : मंत्रिमंडल बनाने के सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने केन्द्रीय सरकार से कोई परामर्श नहीं किया ।

(Shri A. Sreedharan asked a question in Malayalam).

Mr. Speaker: He may please sit down.

Mr. P. K. Deo.

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय की सुविधा के लिये उसका तर्जुमा उन्हें दे दिया गया है । मंत्री महोदय जवाब दें ।

Mr. Speaker: It must also be given to the Speaker. The Speaker must also understand what is being put and what is being answered.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : मैं आपको उसका अनुवाद करके बतला दूंगा ।

श्री मधु लिमये : यह नेताओं की बैठक में तय पाया है कि हर एक को अपनी मातृभाषा में बोलने का अधिकार है ।

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Itwas never decided. I was also there.

श्री मधु लिमये : अब आप खड़े हो जायेंगे तो मैं बोल नहीं पाऊंगा ।

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

श्री मधु लिमये : इस प्रश्न का जवाब आना चाहिए । मेरे साथी उसका अनुवाद करके अभी बताने को तैयार है और मंत्री को उसका अंग्रेजी अनुवाद लिख कर भी दे दिया गया है और वह जवाब दे सकते हैं ।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : मैं हिन्दी में अनुवाद करके बतलाऊंगा कि उनका प्रश्न क्या है ?

Mr. Speaker: I have called Mr. P. K. Deo.

Shri S. Kandappan: There is a precedent. (Interruptions)

Some hon. Members *rose—*

Mr. Speaker: All the hon. members may please sit down. Only one can stand at a time, not so many.

Shri Nath Pai: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: They are also raising it.

Shri Nath Pai: I do not hear anybody saying that. मैं ने किसी को भी व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाते नहीं सुना । व्यवस्था का प्रश्न तो मैं उठा रहा हूं . . . . .

Mr. Speaker: Am I not to understand the question?

श्री मधु लिमये : उन को लिख कर दिया है वह जवाब दें ।

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : मैं उसका अनुवाद करके अभी सदन को बतला दूंगा . . . . . (व्यवधान)

Mr. Speaker: What does he want to say?

Shri S. Kandappan: There is a precedent in this matter. When a ques-

tion was put by a member of our Group in Tamil, the then hon. Speaker directed that the question might be translated into English and then he asked the Minister to reply to it. A similar procedure may be adopted now.

Mr. Speaker: All right then. Who will translate it?

Shri Nath Pai: May I, on this issue, point out this? The rules may not be very clear. There is a ruling. There is a very well established precedent I recall an incident when a Communist Member from West Bengal spoke in Bengali and Mrs. Renu Chakravartty was allowed to translate it, and the whole speech was allowed to go on like this So, there is a very well established procedure

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज मैं उन माननीय सदस्य के मलयालम मे पूछे गये प्रश्न का हिन्दी में अनुवाद करके बता रहा हू । उनका प्रश्न यह था कि राज्यो के राज्यपालो की ओर से अलग अलग समय पर अलग अलग किस्म की नीतियों को बनाने का काम होता है, उदाहरणार्थ, केरल मे एक बार ऐसा हुआ था कि विधान सभा को बर्खास्त करने के बाद भी मत्रीमडल को जारी रखा और दूसरी बार विधान सभा

Shri K. N. Tiwary: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon Member finish it. Then I will call him

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : मैं उनके उस प्रश्न का अनुवाद कर रहा हूं और मुझे फिर कहना पड़ेगा कि इस तरह से टोक कर लोग सदन का वक्त खराब कर रहे हैं ।

दूसरी बार विधान सभा को न बुलाते हुए उसको बर्खास्त करने का काम केरल के गवर्नर साहब ने किया तो जब अलग अलग वक्त अलग अलग तरीके से गवर्नरों का बर्ताव होता है तो क्या सरकार इस बात पर विचार करके राज्यपालों के वास्ते एक आचार संहिता बनाने का काम करेगी ?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. K. N. Tiwary. What is his point of order?

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : अभी यह जो श्री नाथ पाई ने एक रूलिंग और वैल इस्टैब्लिश्ड प्रोसीडेंट के बारे में कहा तो वह स्पीच के बारे मे था लेकिन अगर कवैश्चंस भी हिन्दी और अग्रेजी मे न होकर रीजनल भाषाओं मे होने लगें और उनका ट्रान्स्लेशन होने लगे तो यह कोई पहले का प्रोसीज्योर नही है

श्री मधु लिमये · अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहले वह हम आपको दे देंगे जब तक कि अनुवाद का इन्तजाम नही होता । पूर्व ही आपको उसका अनुवाद दे दिया जायगा ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Madhu Limaye must allow others also to speak. He cannot monopolise the whole thing. Let some other Members also have their say on this

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: May I submit

Mr. Speaker: When one hon Member is on his legs, why should the lady Member get up and shout? I am not able to understand this

श्री क० ना० तिवारी . दूसरी बात यह है कि सवालो के वक्त मैं यह जानना चाहूगा और आपकी रूलिंग इस बात पर चाहूंगा कि सवाल जो होते हैं उनसे इनफौरमेशन लेनी होती है तो उसके पहले कुछ भूमिका दी जायगी और तब सवाल पूछा जायगा या सिर्फ सीधे से सवाल पूछा जायगा?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I wanted only to make a submission. I wanted only to remind the House of one thing. The Question Hour is terribly important, as far as the non-official Members are concerned, and I would not like any contraction of Question Hour if it can be helped.

In regard to the matter of the use of languages, you, Sir, are, according to reports which I have seen in the papers, adopting certain mechanisms which I hope will come into operation as soon as ever that is possible. But in the meantime, if every day, during Question Hour, this kind of delay takes place on account of translations, authorised or not, I do not know, and the Question Hour is impinged upon, then a lot of time which is extremely useful to the House would be wasted. Therefore, I would like your direction in this matter and I would request you not to entertain this kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker: I wanted to say exactly what Shri H. N. Mukerjee had said. If every supplementary question is to be asked in a regional language and then it is going to be translated and retranslated and so on, I do not know what will happen. If hon. Members so desire, let there be only one question taken up during the whole of the Question Hour; it makes absolutely no difference to the Speaker at least. I have been told that a copy of the translation had been given to the hon. Minister. Could they not send one to me also by way of courtesy?....

श्री मधु लिमये : आयन्दा से दे दिया करेंगे ।

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry that Shri Madhu Limaye does not allow anybody in this House to speak at all. He cannot go on like this. He does not allow anybody including the Speaker to speak and he just monopolises the whole time. He cannot go on speaking like this. Now, he is the Leader of a party also.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप इस तरह क्यों बोल रहे हैं ? मैं आपकी बात मान रहा हूं । इस पर बहस की क्या गुंजाइश है ? आप को दे देंगे ।

Mr. Speaker: If hon. Members want the translation to be done, I am game for it, and I have absolutely no objection, but at that rate we could have only one question taken up during the whole of the question hour; I have no objection. Even now, we are covering only four or five questions a day. If that is the desire of hon. Members, I have no objection.

The other day, when we had discussed this matter with the leaders of all parties, that was only regarding speeches; for, we have got a tape-record of the speeches, and that recording will be translated and communicated to the Members some time later; there is no delay involved in that so far as the proceedings here or the business here is concerned. But here, the tape-recording is not going to help much, because if the Minister has to reply to a question put in Malyalam or Telugu and so on, a translation is necessary immediately; if that is going to happen, then there will be no Question Hour at all, parctically speaking.

I entirely agree with Shri H. N. Mukerjee in regard to this matter. If any Member wants to put a question in a language other than Hindi or English, may I suggest that he must send a copy of the translation to the Speaker also so that I may know whether it is a question which can be allowed or not? It cannot simply be a contract between the Treasury Benches and the Opposition Benches without the speaker coming into the picture at all. That is not proper and even if both sides agree, I would not agree to it. A copy of the translation must be sent to the Speaker also.

In regard to the particular supplementary question put by the hon. Member, if the hon. Minister wants, he can answer it.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): I would like to intervene to answer this question. The point is that it is not really speaking an academic question of providing any guiding code of conduct for the Governors. Sometimes, it does happen that as a result of the elections, no party with an absolute majority emer-

ges, and this certainly has happened on some occasions in the past, more especially, as a result of these general elections. So, the question does arise what the guiding principles for the Governors should be. But the constitutional position in this matter is also a thing to be particularly taken note of. The Governor does not function as an agent either of the Government of India or of the President. He functions as the Head of the State, and, therefore, it is a rather very ticklish issue whether any directive can be given by the Government of India or by the President of India also, but certainly it is a case for consideration whether certain principles could be evolved which may help the Governor and guide him on such occasions. If the House expresses that view we shall consider it; we are thinking on these lines because this suggestion was thrown up in the course of certain debates; but I would certainly like to discuss it with some of the Leaders of the Opposition groups and also perhaps consult some constitutional experts not interested in politics, in order to have some sort of advice from them and then evolve some principles on which some sort of a guide-line could be worked out.

Shri P. K. Deo: In view of the bitter experience of different Governors toeing different lines in inviting the leaders of the elected groups to form governments and in view of the fact that in interpreting the status of Independents they are having different standards, as happened in Rajasthan and UP, and in view more particularly of Governors taking active interest in the election of the Prime Minister, as was done by Shri A. P. Jain, in view of all these past experiences, is it not proper that at least this House should get an assurance from the Treasury Benches that Congressmen, particularly those defeated at the polls would not be appointed as Governors?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If it is meant to cast any reflections on any Governor who has served before, I am not prepared to accept any of the reflections. I thought we were discussing the question in a general form without without having any Governor in view. I cannot give any assurance of the type the hon. Member wants.

Shri G. C. Naik: Are there any consultations with non-Congress Chief Ministers regarding the appointment of Governors?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Whenever any Governor is appointed any State, the Chief Minister is definitely consulted

Shri A. Dipa: May I know why the Chief Minister of a State where a non-Congress Government has been formed is not consulted regarding the appointment of the Governor?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I have already answered the question.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: May I know whether the practice of inviting the leader of the largest single group or party which was adopted since 1952 when Shri C. Rajagopalachari who headed the Congress Party in Madras was, asked to form the Government in Madras though his party was not in a majority is being followed now?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: We have already explained all these matters it depends on the discretion and judgment of the Governor and there is no set convention as such in this matter so far.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: May I know whether Governors will keep in view the stability of the Government that would be formed before they invite the leaders because of the constant crossing of floors?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I agree with that view.

Shri Nath Pai: We admire the attitude taken by the Home Minister that in future he would like to consult political constitutional experts and some leaders of Opposition. Perhaps you will agree that the difficulty

about the functioning of the Governors has arisen not because the Constitution is vague but because the office of Governor was degraded by the Centre by making it a matter of patronage and largesse. In view of this, may I know whether this invidious practice will be discontinued and whether my constructive suggestion that appointments of Governors should be subject to ratification by Parliament will receive his sympathetic consideration?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I do not know whether it is constructive, but certainly it is an impractical suggestion.

Shri Nath Pai: He means 'inconvenient' when he says 'impractical'.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: No, no.

Shri K. Lakkappa: Is it not a fact that the functions and powers of the Governors of States constitute a political graveyard? May I know why the Central Government intervenes at all times with respect to the appointment of Ministers, formation of Governments and all that?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: We do not accept these insinuations.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : देश का संविधान कोई ऐडल्ट फ्रैंचाइज के बेसिस पर नही बना था । भारत का संविधान कुछ लोगो ने जल्दी जल्दी मिल कर बनाया और वैस्टेड इन्टेरेस्ट के लोगों ने मिल कर बनाया । मै जानना चाहता हूं कि आज की परिस्थिति मे क्या गृह मंत्री गवर्नरों की बहाली और राष्ट्रपति की बहाली के सम्बन्ध मे कोई ऐसी बात सोच रहे हैं कि आगे चल कर के हिन्दुस्तान के संविधान को स्टेट्स और सेन्टर मे चलाने में ज्यादा आसानी हो?

श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल : अभी ऐसी कोई आवश्यकता नही मालूम हुई ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In reply to a supplementary of an hon. Member, Mr. Shukla said that where there are non-Congress Governments, the Chief Ministers will be consulted in the matter of appointment of Governors. I would like to know from him—and he must be aware that after 21 years of misrule the Congress Government has ended in U.P.

Mr. Speaker: How does it arise out of the supplementary, the Congress Government ending in U.P.?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That is a factual thing.

Mr. Speaker: Put a question.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: As the name of Mr. Gopala Reddy, a Congressman, was announced before the formation of the new Government headed by Mr. Charan Singh, I want to know whether Mr. Charan Singh will be consulted and if a non-Congressman will be appointed Governor there and not a Congressman because a Congress Government does not exist there now?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I have already explained the position.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : तो क्या है ? सफाई हो जायगी ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It may be a very inconvenient question for him, I know, but unfortunately, Mr. Gopala Reddy's name was announced—three names were announced, those of Mr. Hukam Singh, Mr. Gopala Reddy and Mr. G. S. Pathak—when Congress Government was in existence headed by Mr. C. B. Gupta. Now the Congress Government has come to an end. My question is clear. In view of the fact that the Congress Government does not exist any more in U. P. and it is headed by another person, the Jana Congress leader Mr. Charan Singh, may I know whether this appointment will be reconsidered taking into account the changed circumstances.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: No. My answer is very clear now. The process of consultation is naturally something which would happen before the appointment and announcement is made. The consultation took place with the then Chief Minister. Whether he was a Congressman or a non-Congressman is not a material factor. He was consulted, the consultation was over, and his consent was there; he was appointed and his name was announced. It will not be changed.

श्री मधु लिमये : चन्द्रभानु गुप्त की सरकार बादी गई थी ।

Shri Swell: I would like to know whether Government's attention has been drawn to the view expressed by the Chief Minister of Madras that the office of Governor should be done away with and whether it is a fact that a large number of public men of high standing are fighting shy of becoming Governors because they get cribbed, confined and cabined in the seclusion of Raj Bhavan? I would like to know whether Government contemplate initiating any legiation either to do away with the office of Governor or to invest Governors with more powers and responsibilities then they have now.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: No, Sir.

Shri Hem Barua: Since most of the State Governors are appointed from a particular political party, and since the record that they have established is one of partisanship, as it has been amply demonstrated in Rajasthan, and since the hon. Home Minister has said that Mr. Nath Pai's suggestion that appointment of Governors should be subject to ratification by Parliament is impractical—but Mr. Nath Pai says it is inconvenient for the Home Minister, whatever that might be—may I know what practical steps the hon. Minister proposes to adopt to ensure that State Governors do not play a partisan role as they have been doing so far?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I cannot expect this insinuation that all the Governors are appointed from one party.

Shri Hem Barua: I said "most".

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I would again explain this matter. Even today if you just look round the State Capitals, nearly half a dozen senior civil servants, ex-civil servants I should say are Governors. They naturally do not belong to any political party. Even today the Governor of Madras is a person who does not belong to any political party as such. It is not correct to say that people from only one party are selected. One of the Governors today belongs to the party to which the hon. Member belongs.

Shri Nath Pai: We expelled him.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप फुसला कर ले गए ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: They insist that we should appoint good people from other political parties and when we do so they expel him. What can we do? (*Interruptions*). The hon. Member should have patience to listen to me The only guarantee in these matters is to have consultation with the Chief Minister and that rule has invariably been observed and will be observed

Mr. Speaker: The hon Member there.

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit...

Shri T. R. Sonavane: You have called the other Member, why should he stand up now?

An hon. Member: At long last you have called a back bencher but he is denied his opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have called him and he will put his question.

Shri Shankaranand: May I know the qualifications and conditions a person should fulfil for being considered for the governorship?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: No qualifications have been prescribed; the person concerned shall have an outstanding stature in the country.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kachhavaiya.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : मैं बीस बार खड़ा हुआ हूं ।

Mr. Speaker: I have called Shri Kachhavaiya—a Member from your Party. He has also been standing from the very first question today.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : आपको कैसे मालूम है कि मेरे दिल में क्या है और श्री कछवाय के दिल मे क्या है ?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि आधा दर्जन के करीब गैर कांग्रेसी लोगों को राज्यपाल बनाया गया है । इसका मतलब यह है कि अधिकाश कांग्रेसी विचारों वाले या कांग्रेस के बड़े बड़े पदों पर जो लोग रह चुके है उन लोगों को ही राज्यपाल बनाया गया है । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि कांग्रेस के पदों से जिन लोगों को लिया गया है उन्हें राज्यपाल न बना कर निष्पक्ष लोगो में से ही राज्यपाल बनाये जाये, ऐसी व्यवस्था करने के बारे मे आप सोचेंगे ?

श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल . गृह मंत्री जी ने इसके बारे मे कह दिया है कि मुख्य मत्रियो से परामर्श करके इसके बारे मे निर्णय लिया जाता है । इस प्रणाली को आगे भी जारी रखा जाएगा । उसमें ये सभी चीजे आ जाती है ।

Shri P. G. Sen: In view of the fact that there are too many crossing of the floors which upsets the margins of parties in the legislatures is it specifically mentioned that when the majority question has to be decided it should be decided with the specific names in the parties concerned?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: That has already been answered in general terms.

Mr. Speaker: Most of these question have been answered and yet many Members are rising in their seats. I will call everybody and finish the whole question hour in this question.

Shri Zulfiquar Ali Khan: Is it true that according to the Constitution the President can be impeached in this House but the Governors cannot be impeached in the State legislatures?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: It is a constitutional point which can be looked into.

Shri P. K. Deo: It is a defect in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker: But what can the Minister do now if the Constitution does not provide for it.

Shri M. Y. Saleem: How many names are under consideration for Governorship of Jammu and Kashmir and may I know those names?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: That does not arise out of this question.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : राजस्थान के राज्यपाल ने आगज से एक महीना पहले यह कह दिया है कि राजस्थान में कोई अशांति नही है। इसको एक महीना हो गया है । क्या कोई . . .

Mr. Speaker: That does not arise not arise out of this question.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : राज्यपाल ने कहा है कि मुझ से केन्द्र ने नही पूछा । क्या केन्द्र की इस बारे में कोई जिम्मेदारी है या नही ?

Mr. Speaker: I do not want your explanation.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : राज्यपाल ने यह कहा है कि हम से कोई राय नहीं ली गई शांति के बारे में । मुझ से पूछेंगे तो मैं बताऊंगा । क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार ने राज्यपाल साहब से पूछा है कि शांति हुई है या नहीं हुई है ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order "Rajyapal" does not mean that you should say so many things.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : उत्तर आना चाहिये ।

श्री शुक्ल चन्द्र कटवाय : उत्तर नहीं आया है ।

Mr. Speaker: Please take your seat.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : राज्यपाल के बारे में सवाल है । उत्तर आना चाहिये ।

Mr. Speaker: I am requesting you to take your seat please.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा : राज्यपाल से सम्बन्धित सवाल है, उत्तर दिलाइये ।

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: The hon. Home Minister was saying that the Governor of Madras is a non-partisan. We regret to state that he is not at all so. Before the elections—I do not want to make any allegations against the present Governor of Madras—I would tell you what he said. We the opposition parties in Madras State united together and wanted to fight the elections During that time, the Governor of Madras State openly said that he would not call anybody who did not have any single party majority. Unfortunately for the Governor, we won with 138 seats. In view of the fact that this is an important matter and in view of the fact that the post of a Governor is an important one—he is the head of the State in a sovereign democracy—will the Government look into the matter and see that the Government appoint only such people for the post of Governor, who are really interested in safeguarding democracy and who are really impartial people?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: It is always done.

Shri Kandappan: The point has to be clarified.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has replied to it; I do not know what more he can say. He could not off-hand say what the Governor said before the elections.

Shri S. Kandappan: Let him collect the information and place it on the Table of House.

Mr. Speaker: Can he say what the Governor said before the elections?

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: How can the Minister say that he is a non-partisan? The Governor has openly said— (Interruption)

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: In answer to his question I said that it is always done so.

Shri Rajaram: There was a very big controversy raised before the election. (*Interruption*).

Some hon. Member *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. They can't shout like that.

Shri Rajaram: I am sorry to say that you are saying they are shouting This is not shouting. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Three or four persons are speaking at the same time.

Shri Rajaram: Before the elections, the Governor of Madras, Mr. Ujjal Singh, came forward with a statement that the united parties were not going to solve the problem of the country. He had said like that. There was a very big controversy before the elections. So, he is a partisan of the Congress party.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: Let the Congress Government here withdraw that Governor from the Madras State. How can the Minister say that he is a non-partisan?

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : गवर्नर की एप्वाइंटमेंट और उसका कंडक्ट बहुत महत्वपूर्ण

चीजें हैं। इसको हमने इलेक्शन में देख लिया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इस सब के बारे में लीडर्स आफ दि अपोजीशन के साथ बैठकर कोई रास्ता निकाला जायगा ताकि आगे कनफ्यूजन पैदा न हो? यह बहुत जरूरी है।

Mr. Speaker: I am very unhappy today. This is not the way of getting through the questions. Of course, three or four supplementary questions would have been sufficient. But we have spent more than half an hour on this question. There are very important questions coming up. If you still want to put more questions on this Question alone, I have absolutely no objection, but then nobody should feel that he is not called.

Shri Sonavane: Sir, may I make a suggestion? It is very difficult for you to go on with the questions in this way. Hardly a few questions have been touched. I do not konw the propriety; so many questions have been put down on the list for answer today. It is up to you to apply a brake whenever all the possible supplementaries are exhausted, and then go forward.

Shri S. S. Kothari: Sir, Supplementaries should be limited to five.

Mr. Speaker: I entirely agree with the hon. member. At least if the leaders of the parties help, I will be able to do it. It was agreed that even if there are a dozen names, only noe or two from them and one or two others might be called to put supplementaries. But from Mr. Barua to Mr. Kachhavaiya, every member gets so wild if he is not called to put supplementaries. After calling one or two from this side and one or two from that side, we should go to the next question. If 20 or 30 members get up, I feel helpless. If the House agrees, let us have 5 supplementaries on each questions and then we shall pass on to the next question. Is it agreed to?

Shri Sonavane: Yes, Sir; 2 from that side and 3 from this side.

Shri S. S. Kothari: 3 from the opposition and 2 from the Congress.

Mr. Speaker: 20 or 30 people get up and if I call one or two from this side and one or two from that side, I find that the others are annoyed. If the leaders of the parties assure me that they agree, after 5 or 6 supplementaries we can go to the next question. Mr. Kachhavaiya has got a leader for his party. Leaders of the various parties and myself meet in my Chamber and discuss constitutional points, etc. So, he can instruct his leader if he has got some point, whether 5 supplementaries should be allowed or 10 should be allowed or the whole one hour should be spent on one question, etc. Members can give their ideas to their leaders and we shall discuss them in my chamber. Otherwise, I find for everything every member stands up.

Shri S. Xavier: In view of the complaints made in this House about the partiality of the Madras Governor, may I suggest that there should be an election to the Governor's post, as in the case of the President?

Mr. Speaker: Mr Nath Pai has put the question already that Parliament must approve of the Governor's appointment.

Shri R. Barua: If I have understood aright, the suggestion seems to be that the supplementaries should be sent in writing. If that is the rule, I submit the very purpose of putting supplementaries is lost.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody has suggested that. The suggestion is that the number of supplementaries should be limited to 5.

Shri Piloo Mody: We have been discussing all the time how many supplementaries can or cannot be put. I think it is a very childish procedure. In Question Hour, it is necessary that at least 20 to 30 questions should be answered. The number of supplementaries depends very much on the subject-matter of the question. The number of supplementaries that are being asked are too

many for one primary reason that the ministers concernd do not give a proper answer. If I may say so, it would help considerably all the members of this House if whenever you find that the minister has not given a relevant answer, you immediately call him to give a proper answer.

Shri Nath Pai: You should pull him up.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने अभी मेरे नाम का उल्लेख किया है । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हमें जनता ने यहां पर भेजा है, ताकि हम उस पर की समस्याओं को यहां पर रखें । अगर मंत्री महोदय हमारे प्रश्नों का ठीक उत्तर नहीं देते, तो हमें मजबूर हो कर उस के लिये आग्रह करना पड़ता है ।

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: On a point of order, Sir. Just now in your wisdom you made the suggestion that the number of supplementaries will be limited to 5. The hon. member has made a very unfortunate remark that the procedure is childish. May I know how far that remark is compatible with the decorum of the Chair?

Mr. Speaker: Doesn't matter Next question.

All India Judicial Service

*261. **Shri Yashpal Singh:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 575 on the 30th November, 1966 and state:

(a) whether Government have since received replies from the State Governments regarding the setting up of an All-India Judicial Service; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Replies have so far been received from the Governments of six States.

(b) Replies from other State Governments are awaited. A decision will be taken after replies from all State Governments have been received.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : क्या सरकार ने यह भी जानने की कोशिश की है कि अंग्रेज स्पेशल मैजिस्ट्रेटस और आनरेरी मैजिस्ट्रेटस इस लिये बनाया करते थे कि वे इस देश में ब्रिटिश इम्पीरियलिज्म को मजबूत करते थे और आज भारत के जनतन्त्र में स्पेशल मैजिस्ट्रेटस और आनरेरी मैजिस्ट्रेटस के लिये कोई जगह नहीं है, यदि हां, तो क्या सरकार इन पोस्ट्स को एबोलिश करने की कोशिश कर रही है ?

श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल : इस प्रश्न का मूल प्रश्न से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह . क्या सरकार बता सकती है कि जिन स्टेटस से सरकार को इत्तिला मिली है, उन में जुडिशियरी और एक्सीक्यूटिव को कब तक अलग कर दिया जायेगा ?

श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल . इस बारे में पहले ही जवाब दिया जा चुका है । अधिकतर राज्यों में जुडिशियरी और एक्सीक्यूटिव को अलग कर दिया गया है और जहां पूरी तरह से अलग नहीं किया गया है, वहां यह कार्य चालू है ।

Shri S. Kandappan: Sir, there is an unhealthy tendency of creating more and fore All-India services in all fields. I would like to know, in view of the fact that face that non-Congress Governments have been set up in various States, whether Government will try to assess the opinion of the new governments that have been formed before going ahead with this programme.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I have already answered that all these things will be decided in consultation with the State Governments.

Mr. Speaker: What he wants is, even if you have consulted the State Governments, in view of the fact that new governments have been formed, you should consult them again. Are you going to do that?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Yes.

Shri Nath Pai: Is it not a fact that the Chief Justice of the High Court of Delhi has written to the Home Minister asking for an immediate separation of executive from the judiciary; if so, may I know what steps the Home Minister proposes to take to implement this request of the Chief Justice of Delhi?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): Yes, Sir, such a suggestion has come from the Chief Justice of the Delhi High Court. But in these matters necessary legislation will have to be initiated by the Metropolitan Council and we have made a reference to them. I hope they will take early action.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, there is a famous expression *suppressio veri suggestio falsi*. He has given then truth but it is not the whole truth. He has also suggested in his letter to the hon. Minister that by an executive order this separation can be brought about and we need not wait for any legislation. Am I right?

Shri Y. B Chavan: He has certainly made that suggestion, but in the present circumstances, when a new party has come into power in the Metropolitan Council, if we just pass an executive order, possibly I would be required to answer half a dozen questions here also. Therefore, it is very much necessary for me, in the new political situation, that about the policy in these matters I consult the Executive Council.

Changes in the Education System

*262. **Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the address delivered at the Institute of Technology, Kanpur by the Chairman of the University Graats Commission in which he stressed the need for revolutionary changes in the system of education;

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto; and

(c) the steps being taken to change the pattern of education so that it could adjust to the changing circumstances?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) to (c). Yes, Sir. This is the central theme in the Report of the Education Commission which is now under the active consideration of Government. The main recommendations of the Education Commission are being examined in consultation with State Governments with a view to speedy implementation within the limit of financial resources available.

श्री एस० सी० सामन्त : क्या यह सच है कि आजादी के बाद गवर्नमेंट ने शिक्षा पद्धति मे तब्दीली लाने की कोशिश की और बुनियादी तालीम को लागू किया; यदि हां, तो उसका नतीजा क्या हुआ ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद यह सच है कि हमने बुनियादी तालीम को इस देश में लागू करने की कोशिश की और यह भी सच है कि उस मे हम अब तक बहुत सफल नही हो पाये हैं । लेकिन उसके सिद्धात के बारे में कोई मतभेद नही है ।

श्री एस० सी० सामन्त : क्या गवर्नमेंट की मशा परीक्षा-पद्धति में कोई तब्दीली लाने की है ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : यह सच है कि समय समय पर देश के शिक्षाविदों ने इस बात पर प्रकाश डाला है कि देश की परीक्षा पद्धति में परिवर्तन होना चाहिये । एजूकेशन कमीशन की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने

है, जिस पर हम विचार कर रहे हैं । हम यह भी विचार करना चाहेंगे कि परीक्षा पद्धति में क्या परिवर्तन किया जा सकता है ।

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether Government's attention has been drawn to the suggestions made by various eminent men in public life that there should be conformity in the system of education and all the public schools which discriminate between one school and another school should be abolished; if so, what is the Government's attitude in this matter and whether there is any proposal for abolition of public schools so that all the schools will have a simultaneous course and an equitable basis for education?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: It is true that there is an opinion in the country that the education in public schools and other schools are in different ways and of different standards. Certainly, the public schools have a higher standard of education and very few get admission there It is not possible for us to pull down one unless we pull up the other in the matter of standard.

Shri K. Lakkappa: Is it not a fact that in the address delivered at the Institute of Technology, Kanpur, the Chairman of the University Grants Commission has suggested that defeated Congress leaders and politicians should not be appointed as Vice-Chancellors? Is it not a fact that this is one of the diseases that has entered the universities and is creating confusion and that is why it has been suggested that a revolutionary change is to be effected?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: This question does not arise out of the main question.

श्री हा० ना० तिवारी :क्या सरकार को मालूम है कि विगत तीस वर्षों में कितने कमीशन और कितनी कमेटीज की रिपोर्टें सरकार के सामने आई और राष्ट्रपति से लेकर केन्द्रीय शिक्षा मंत्री और प्रांतों के मंत्रियों ने शिक्षा पद्धति में परिवर्तन करने की सिफारिश की और बार बार कहा कि बिना शिक्षा पद्धति में परिवर्तन किये हुए शिक्षा यहां ठीक नहीं चल सकती तो आज तक सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या किया और कितने दिनों के बाद सरकार नींद से जागेगी और कुछ कार्यवाही करने की सोचेगी ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : सरकार को यह मालूम है कि बहुत सी कमेटिया बनाई गई है । यह बात भी सच है कि हम इस में परिवर्तन करना चाहते है । देश के शिक्षाविदो ने यह कहा है । हम यह चाहते है कि अभी जो एजूकेशन कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आई है इस पर विचार किया जाय । इस के लिये वर्तमान शिक्षा मंत्री राज्यो का दौरा कर रहे हैं । साथ ही हम शिक्षा मंत्रियो की एक कान्फ्रेंस बुला रहे हैं और संसद सदस्यो से बात चीत करना चाहते है कि किस तरह से नयी शिक्षा प्रणाली को चलाया जाय ।

Shri Buta Singh: What is standing in the way of the Government implementing the suggestion to create a separate cadre called the All India Educational Service?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद यह प्रश्न हम लोगों के सामने है और इस प्रश्न पर हमने राज्य सरकारो से विचार लिये है । राज्य सरकारो के विचार विभिन्न है । सभी राज्य सरकारो के विचार आने पर ही हम अपनी राय निश्चित कर सकते है ।

Shri H N. Mukerjee: In view of the very positive recommendation of the Education Commission in regard to the desirability of having our mother languages as the medium of instruction right up to the higher stage, may I know if at long last Government is going to take some very definite steps in that direction with a programme to be achieved over a period of time?

Shri Nath Pai: Ambivalent position.

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): I am told that this House is the only body which is competent to lay down policies. I am sorry that due to various reasons the

recommendations of the Education Commission were not considered by this House. As a member of the Commission I am very keen that this House considers it and recommends certain policy on which the Government will act. I feel that the education must be in the mother tongue or the regional languages. With that end in view, I am moving round and meeting Education Ministers and Chief Ministers of all the States to come to a consensus so that I can place before the House the opinion of all the States. Then it is for this House to direct what should be the policy so that the Government can act. I am very keen that it should be done as soon as possible. Unless this vital issue of language is decided by this House, well the standard of education cannot go up and we cannot direct the educational system also.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: In view of the student's unrest all over the country for the last few years, does the Education Minister propose to have any change in the educational system so that this unrest could be checked?

Dr. Triguna Sen: I do not believe firstly, that there is student unrest; it is discontentment among the students in the country The main reason to my mind is that we do not listen to the needs of the students When we do not listen to the needs, the needs become demands. I personally feel that the students have a right to demonstrate if there needs are not met by the authorities. Naturally, I shall request the students to demonstrate peacefully within the campuses of universities.

Shri S. Kandappan: I compliment the Education Minister.

Dr. Triguna Sen : I have not finished yet. I am going to request the administrators of the various institutions. . . .

Mr. Speaker: This is Question Hour when only supplementary questions can be answered. The whole policy of the Government cannot be enunciated on a supplementary question. Next question.

Shri K. Lakkappa : On a point of order.

Shri Nath Pai: You had called me.

Mr. Speaker : He wants to raise a point of order.

Shri K. Lakkappa : The hon. Minister has made a statement now . . .

Mr. Speaker : Do you want to make another statement contradicting him?

Shri K. Lakkappa: No. He has said that students' unrest and their grievances can be raised by way of demonstrations in university campuses. Is it the policy of Government or is it his statement? I want to have that clarification.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai.

Some hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: I have called Shri Nath Pai. I will call all of you also

Shri Nath Pai: The statement of the hon. Education Minister, if not anything else, was at least very polite to the House inasmuch as he has asserted the supremacy of the House in giving consideration to these matters but it conceals the lamentable lapse on the part of Government to make up its mind. Sir, it used to be said about equity that equity changes according to the shoe of the Lord Chancellor of England but the language and educational policy of the Government of India changes according to the predilection and prejudice of the man who happens to be the Education Minister. Is it not a fact that the hon. Minister only the other day said in Madras that he is not in favour of the three-language formula? Does he know that the three-language formula was adopted by this House? Where do we stand in this matter?

Dr. Triguna Sen: I think, I issued a clarification in Ahmedabad. Some people asked me whether the three-language formula should be introduced and I said that it required rethinking because we cannot at a particular stage ask young children to learn three languages at a time and also ask them to read something of Indian History, mathematics and geography; so, it requires some rethinking. I did not say that I was not in favour of the three-language formula

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order, Sir. This three-language formula was adopted by this House. When the hon. Minister says that it needs rethinking, he goes against the wishes of the House I want to know whether he has a right to do it or not That is my point of order

Mr. Speaker: Shri Venkatasubbaiah.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: In view of the fact that Shri Nath Pai has raised a very relevant question regarding rethinking of the three-language formula, may I know whether it is appropriate for the Minister of Education to make such a statement without taking Parliament into confidence?

Dr. Triguna Sen: I have not said anything that I am against the three-language formu'a I only posed the question to Shri Nath Pai whether the three lanuages should be taught to the child at the same time

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय भागवत झा आजाद ने प्रश्न के उत्तर में कहा कि बुनियादी तालीम को सफलता नहीं मिली । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या असफलता का यह कारण है कि गरीबों के लिये बुनियादी तालीम और अमीरों के लिये पब्लिक स्कूल हैं और इसी कारण असफलता हुई है ? अगर यह सही है तो समान शिक्षा सभी को मिले, इस के लिये क्या प्रयत्न होने जा रहा है ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : बुनियादी शिक्षा इस देश में चलाई गई तो इस अर्थ से नहीं चलाई गई कि सिर्फ गरीबों के लिये ही यह हो बल्कि आज भी सरकार समझती है कि सब लोगों के लिये यह है । जहां तक पब्लिक स्कूलों का सवाल है पब्लिक स्कूलों में दाखिला इतने कम विद्यार्थियो का होता है कि वहां पर सभी पैसे वालो को जगह मिलती है, वहां कहना कठिन है ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : क्या वहां पर बुनियादी तालीम है ? यह सवाल है ।

12 00 hrs.

Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi: While considering the recommendations of the Education Commission, would the Government consider the feasibility or the advisability of linking up education with employment also?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: We do realise that education should be fruitful and it would be good if education can be reoriented or coordinated with some vocational training

Shri S M Banerjee: It was assured by his predecessor, Mr Chagla, in the House that he was trying to impress upon the Chief Ministers of the States to see that education is included in the Concurrent List. I would like to know the view of the present Education Minister in this regard and whether any success has been achieved in this direction

Dr. Triguna Sen: The changed political situation, I think, requires a little rethinking. We must carry all the States together before we come to any decision

Mr. Speaker: Question Hour is over We now take up the Short Notice Question.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है—नियम सं० 46 के अन्तर्गत। इस नियम में यह व्यवस्था है कि यदि मंत्री चाहे तो जिन प्रश्नों का जवाब क्वेश्चन आवर में नहीं आया है, उस का जवाब आपकी इजाजत से दे सकता है । मंत्री महोदय से मैंने पूछा है, वे प्रश्न सं० 296 का उत्तर देने को तयार हैं । नियम इस प्रकार है :

"Provided that a question not reached.....

Shri Sonavane: On a point of information, Sir. I want to know whether the provision....

श्री मधु लिमये : अभी मैं नियम पढ़ रहा हूं, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न आप बीच में कैसे उठा सकते हैं ?

Shri Sonavane: He has allowed me to speak.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Madhu Limaye was already reading the rule.

Shri Sonavane: I thought you allowed me.

Mr. Speaker: No, no; he was already reading it.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं उसका जो प्रोवीजो है, केवल उस को पढता हू :

"Provided that a question not reached for oral answer may be answered after the end of the Question Hour with the permission of the Speaker if the Minister represents to the Speaker that the question is one of special public interest to which he desires to give a reply."

Mr. Speaker: That is quite clear. The Minister has not done so. He should write to me and not to you.

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री जी जवाब देने को तैयार हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: He has not done it. We now take up the Short Notice question. Shri Indrajit Gupta.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं उन से पूछ कर ही यह कह रहा हूं ।

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

Telegraph Check Office, Calcutta

+

S.N.Q. 6. Shri Indrajit Gupta:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri H. N. Mukerjee:
Shri Vasudevan Nair:
Shri Bhogendra Jha:

Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether it has been decided to close down the Telegraph Check Office, Calcutta, which has been working for about a hundred years;

(b) whether this decision has been taken on the advice of a so-called "expert" from U.K.;

(c) if so, the reasons for the same; and

(d) whether over 700 employees are going to be retrenched as a result thereof?

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): (a) No.

(b) to (d). Do not arise.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: May I know whether there is any proposal to reorganise the work of this Telegraph Check Office so that a large number of staff who are at present employed there will have to be transfered elsewhere and if so, what is the future trend of this Telegraph Check Office?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: With a view to increasing efficiency, we shall have to reorganise everything including this Office. But I may say that the interests of the staff will be fully protected

Shri Indrajit Gupta: May I know whether it is not a fact that this Telegraph Check Office is the only one of its kind in India and it has been performing a very useful function for over a hundred years and whether this proposal for reorganisation has come only as a result of the advice given by any so-called foreign expert?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: It is a fact that this is the only Office. But the lapse of hundred years does require some re-thinking.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I asked whether this proposal for reoganisation is the result of the advice given by any so-called foreign expert.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The advice was sought because there was original thinking here.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would like to know whether it is a fact—part (d) of the question—that over 700 employees are going to be retrenched as a result of this. I want to know whether there is going to be any retrenchment as a result of this.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: He said that their interests would be fully protected and that covers this question.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I know why it is that after more than a hundred years of working the telegraphic system in our country, we still appear, according to Government, to stand in need of assistance from British experts whose advice in this kind of thing need not be regarded by us at all?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: As the hon. Member knows, a hundred years' time does require improving the situation. Therefore, we are thinking how best to reorganise it. But I again categorically say that the interests of the staff will have our full sympathy.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I should like to know whether there is a specific recommendation by the British expert that the staff can be reduced in this Check Post Office and if so, by how many.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I do not know why they are time and again trying to say something which I do not intend to do. There would not be any impect on the interests of the staff.

Shri Bhogendra Jha: Among the suggestions, was there a suggestion for closing it?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Suggestions may include so many things. But we shall have to take a decision.

Shri Bhogendra Jha: Was there any suggestion for closing it?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: There may be so many suggestions, but it does not mean that they are going to be accepted.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Whitley Council Scheme

*263. **Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Whitley Council Scheme has been working satisfactorily; and

(b) if so, how far it has been successful?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). The Scheme for Joint Consultative Machinery and Compulsory Arbitration was inaugurated on 28th October, 1966. After the inauguration of the Scheme the National Council held a special meeting on 5th December, 1966 and an ordinary meeting on 30th and 31st January, 1967. It is proposed to hold the next meeting of the National Council on 26th and 27th May, 1967 So far it has been functioning well.

अध्यापकों के वेतन-क्रम

*264. श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
श्री एस० सूपकर :
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री विभूति मिश्र :
श्री क० ना० तिवारी :

क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) अध्यापकों के वेतन-क्रम बढ़ाने में अब तक और क्या प्रगति हुई है;

(ख) अध्यापकों के वेतन-क्रमों को बढ़ाने के बारे में केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय के अनुसार किन-किन राज्य सरकारों ने तथा संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों ने अपेक्षित निर्णय कर लिया है;

(ग) क्या इस प्रयोजन के लिये चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में कोई राशि नियत की गई है; और

(ब) यदि हां, तो क्या उसके आधार पर कोई योजना भी तैयार की गई है ?

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री भागवत झा आजाद) : (क) से (घ) . विवरण सभा पटल पर रख दिया गया है। [पुस्तकालय में रखा गया । देखिये संख्या एल०टी० 239/67]

Common Link between Punjab and Haryana

*265. **Shri C. C. Desai:**
Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
Shri R. Barua:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the progress made so far to resolve the disputes arising out of common links between Punjab and Haryana States after their formation; and

(b) whether any decision has been taken about the future of Chandigarh, as to its inclusion in either of the two States?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See* No LT-240/67].

Wage Board for Scavengers

*266. **Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a decision has been taken to appoint a Wage Board or a Committee to consider the Wage and Working conditions of the Scavengers in the country; and

(b) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) There is no proposal for the appointment of a Wage Board. The proposal for the setting up of a study group to examine the working and service conditions of sweepers and scavengers, was brought to the notice of the National Commission on Labour which has decied to set up a study group of its own on the subject.

(b) Does not arise.

Surpluses in Engineering Cadres

*267. **Shri P. K. Ghosh:**
Shri S. C. Samanta:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Committee constituted by the Planning Commission to study the problem regarding demands of and existing surplus in civil and other construction engineering cadres as well as possibilities of forming service cadres has finalised its report and if so, what are its conclusions; and

(b) whether Government have issued directives to all the public undertakings not to resort to retrenchment till the report is made available and till the surplus engineers are provided with alternative placements?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) The Committee constituted for the purpose has not yet finalised its report.

(b) No, Sir.

Cases against Bombay Business Firms

*268. **Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:**
Shri Madhu Limaye:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Economic Offences Wing, Madras registered cases under RC 1/66 and D. S. Company, Delhi and Madhusudan Govardhandas, Bombay were also among the 40 traders in whose names warrants were issued by the Chief Presidency Magistrate, Egmore Madras during the last week of January, 1966;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the Officers carrying warrants to Bombay and Delhi went back on the advice of Dy. Director or any other

officer of the Central Vigilance Commission without making any investigations at Delhi and Bombay;

(c) whether it is also a fact that when these officers were called upon to investigate into the matter after an interval of four days, they refused to investigate as a protest against the interference from Delhi, and

(d) if so, the reasons for this interference by the Central Vigilance Commission?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y B. Chavan): (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the Table of the House [*Placed in Library See* No LT-241/67]

Files Missing in Bihar and West Bengal

*269. **Shri Madhu Limaye:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have seen reports about the missing files in Bihar and West Bengal after the coming into existence of the non-Congress Governments or after the defeat of Congress at the polls and the transfer of some of these files (Intelligence reports) to the Centre,

(b) if so, whether these reports are true,

(c) whether any instructions were issued by the Centre in regard to these transfers, and

(d) if so, the nature of these transfers?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Government have seen reports in a section of the Press about the transfer of certain secret records from the custody of the West Bengal Government to that of the Central Government

(b) and (c). The Central Government had made a request to the Governments of West Bengal and Bihar for the transfer of certain documents which had a bearing on national security and the request was complied with.

(d) It will not be in the public interest to disclose any further information about the documents transferred

Stay-in Strike in Katchi Balihari Colliery

*270 **Shri A. K. Gopalan:**
Shri Umanath:

Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state

(a) whether it is a fact that four miners in Balihari Colliery became unconscious and several others suffered severe abdominal cramps on the 4th March, 1967 while they were on stay-in strike,

(b) the total number of workers involved in the stay in strike,

(c) the demands of the workers; and

(d) the action taken to settle the grievances of the workers prior to and after the commencement of the strike?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N Mishra): (a) No such cases were reported to the Central Conciliation Machinery

(b) 97.

(c) Immediate payment of outstanding legal dues

(d) Before the commencement of the strike, claim applications were filed before the Labour Court, Ranchi for securing payment of outstanding dues The Central conciliation machinery held discussions with both sides to bring about a settlement. The strike has since been called off.

Family Pension Scheme for Industrial Workers

***271. Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:**
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the family pension scheme for industrial workers has been finally prepared;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the categories of persons which will be benefited by this scheme?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) to (c). The report of the Working Group which is considering the matter is still awaited and the details are yet to be worked out.

Committee of Review of Rehabilitation

***272. Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Committee of Review of Rehabilitation has submitted its report;

(b) if so, the nature of the recommendations made therein; and

(c) if not, when it will be submitted?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) No, Sir. The Committee was set up in January, 1967, but has not so far been able to commence its work.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) In the Resolution constituting the Committee, it has been asked to submit its report "as early as practicable".

महानगर परिषद् दिल्ली

***273. श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :**
श्री बलराज मधोक :
श्री यज्ञ दत्त शर्मा :
श्री श्रीचन्द गोयल :
श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि दिल्ली महानगर परिषद् में पांच सदस्यों के नाम-निर्देशन के लिये केन्द्रीय सरकार ने बहुमत-प्राप्त दल की सलाह को नही माना ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि सरकार ने अन्तरिम महानगर परिषद् में सदस्यों को नामनिर्देशत करने में कांग्रेस दल की सलाह को माना था ; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो क्या सदस्यों के नाम-निर्देशन के लिये कोई विशेष सिद्धांत बनाये गये है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) से (ग). उपराज्यपाल द्वारा सरकार को नामनिर्देशनों के सम्बन्ध मे सिफारिशें दिये जाने से पहले महानगर परिषद् में बहुमत-प्राप्त दल के नेता ने उपराज्यपाल को कुछ सुझाव दिये थे। अंतरिम महानगर परिषद् में नामनिर्देशन के लिये सरकार को दिल्ली प्रदेश कांग्रेस समिति, संसद् सदस्यों तथा अन्य व्यक्तियों द्वारा अनेक परामर्श दिये गये थे। ये नाम-निर्देशन करने का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार का है और उसके लिये महानगर परिषद में बहुमत-प्राप्त दल से परामर्श करना या उसकी सलाह मानना जरूरी नहीं है। ये नामनिर्देशन विभिन्न हितों को उचित प्रतिनिधित्व देने की आवश्यकता के अनुसार किये जाते हैं और ऐसा करते समय इन परामर्शों पर यथोचित ध्यान दिया जाता है।

Alleged Circular Issued by Pak High Commission

*274. **Shri Ram Krishan Gupta:**
Shri Baburao Patel:
Dr. Mahadeva Prasad:
Shri Onkar Singh:
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any letter from the West Bengal Government asking whether criminal proceedings should be started in connection with an alleged circular of the Pakistan High Commission in India involving India's security; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). The Government of India have not received any letter from the Government of West Bengal in regard to any circular of the Pakistan High Commission in India. The Government of West Bengal had, however, sought the views of the Central Government as to whether action could be taken under rule 41 of the Defence of India Rules, 1962 in connection with a pamphlet, found in circulation in certain areas of the State on the eve of the General Elections, which contained photostat copy of a letter alleged to have been written by the Pakistan High Commissioner in India to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. The pamphlet, which bears no name of its printer or publisher, and which has been described by the Pakistan High Commission as forgery, sought to create the impression that Shri Atulya Ghosh is a paid agent of Pakistan. The State Government were of the view that as the leaflet was intended or likely to prejudice Indias relations with a foreign power and also to prejudice the maintenance of public order, it was a prejudicial document within the meaning of rule 35 (7) read with rule 35(6)(a) and (b) of the Defence of India Rules. Since Government's policy is to restrict the use of the Defence of India Rules, outside certain border areas, to the purposes connected with national security, the State Government was advised not to make use of the Defence of India Rules.

Indian Audit and Accounts Department Employees Union

*275 **Shri Umanath:**
Shri C. K. Chakrapani:
Shri Pattiah Gopalan:
Shri K. M. Abraham:
Shri V. Vishwanatha Menon:
Shri K. Anirudhan:
Shrimati Suseela Gopalan:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state

(a) whether the Indian Audit and Accounts Department Employees Union has since been recognised;

(b) if not, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether the rules for the recognition of Government employees' unions have since been finalised;

(d) if so, the details thereof,

(e) if not, the reasons for the delay in formulating the rules, and

(f) when it is proposed to be finalised?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) All-India Non-gazetted Audit & Accounts Association is now being treated as recognised for purposes of participation in the scheme for joint consultative machinery and compulsory arbitration for Central Government employees.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) and (f). The scheme for joint consultative machinery and compulsory arbitration for Central Government employees has been started for an experimental period and the question of framing formal rules for the recognition of associations and unions of Government employees will be taken up in due course.

उत्तर प्रदेश–बिहार सीमा विवाद

*276. **श्री चन्द्रिका प्रसाद :** क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री नेहरू ने त्रिवेदी आयोग के प्रतिवेदन के आधार पर उत्तर प्रदेश-बिहार की स्थायी सीमा निर्धारित की थी और उस प्रतिवेदन में की गई सिफारिशों को कार्यरूप देने वाले विधेयक से दोनों राज्य सहमत थे;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि इस निर्णय को क्रियान्वित न करने के परिणाम स्वरूप दोनों राज्यों की सीमा पर फसल काटने पर झगड़ा, हत्या तथा हिंसा की घटनायें हो जाना एक सामान्य बात हो गई है; और

(ग) क्या यह भी सच है कि मार्च, 1967 के आरम्भ में बलिया (उत्तर प्रदेश) और शाहबाद (बिहार) सीमा पर हिंसात्मक घटनाएं होने के कारण चार व्यक्ति मारे गये थे और सैकड़ों व्यक्ति घायल हो गये थे जिसके परिणामस्वरूप दोनों ओर के निवासी अपने गाव छोड़ कर भाग गये और उनकी फसलों को लूटा जा रहा है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण) : (क) उत्तरप्रदेश के बलिया जिले और बिहार के शाहबाद जिले के बीच वर्तमान सीमा गंगा नदी की गहरी धारा है। यह सीमा नदी की बदलती हुई धार के साथ-साथ परिवर्तित होती रहती है। श्री सी० एम० त्रिवेदी ने इस प्रश्न पर विचार किया था कि क्या इस सीमा के स्थान पर एक स्थिर सीमा निश्चित की जाये, और यदि हां तो वह सीमा क्या हो और एक स्थिर सीमा के बारे में सिफारिश भी की थी । इन सिफारिशों को स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री ने स्वीकार कर लिया था और इसके बाद संविधान के अनुच्छेद 3 के परंतुकों के अधीन दोनों राज्यों के विधान मंडलों को इन सिफारिशों के क्रियान्वय की दृष्टि से एक विधेयक भेजा गया। दोनों राज्यों के विधान मंडलों ने विधेयक के बारे में अपने विचार व्यक्त कर दिये हैं। संसद् के अगले अधिवेशन में इस विधेयक को प्रस्तुत करने का विचार है।

(ख) श्री त्रिवेदी के अपने सिफारिशें देने से पहले की सीमा के बदलते रहने के कारण दोनों राज्यों के सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों में फसल काटने पर झगड़े हुये। ये झगड़े आम बात नही बन सके क्योंकि ये सिफारिशे क्रियान्वित नही हुई।

(ग) बिहार तथा उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकारों से प्राप्त सूचना के अनुसार अभी हाल ही में गंगा नदी के बिहार की तरफ वाले तट पर एक घटना हुई जिसमे तीन व्यक्ति मारे गये और कुछ घायल हुये। बिहार सरकार के कथनानुसार घायल व्यक्तियों की संख्या नही बताई गई किन्तु यह सैकड़ों में नही है । उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने सूचित किया है कि दियारा क्षेत्र मे फूस के झोपड़ों में रहने वाले कुछ किसान इस घटना के बाद उस स्थान को छोड़ गये। दोनों राज्य सरकारों में से किसी ने भी फसल के लूटे जाने की सूचना नहीं दी।

बिहार में ईसाई धर्म-प्रचारकों की गतिविधियां

*277. **श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :** क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि बिहार के

सूखाग्रस्त क्षेत्रों में ईसाई धर्म-प्रचारक भूख से तड़पते हुये लोगों को प्रलोभन देकर उनका धर्म-परिवर्तन करने मे खूब व्यस्त हैं;

(ख) यदि हां, तो ईसाई धर्म-प्रचारकों ने पिछले तीन महीनों मे ऐसे कितने लोगों का धर्म-परिवर्तन किया है; और

(ग) इस प्रकार के अवैध धर्म-परिवर्तन को रोकने के लिये क्या कार्यवाही की गई है?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल): (क) सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कोई कारण नहीं कि ऐसा है।

(ख) एक धर्म से दूसरे धर्म मे होने वाले धर्म परिवर्तनों को पंजीकृत करने की व्यवस्था किसी कानून मे नहीं है। अतः इस बारे मे सूचना उपलब्ध नहीं है।

(ग) अवैध धर्म परिवर्तन का कोई मामला सामने नहीं आया।

Retrenchment in M/s. Braithwaite and Company, Calcutta

*278. **Shri Indrajit Gupta:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Labour Minister of West Bengal has approached him for taking suitable action to avert the threatened retrenchment of about 2,000 engineering workers of M/s. Braithwaite and Company, Calcutta, who are pleading reduction of railway wagon orders for taking such a course,

(b) whether he has taken up this matter with the Railway Board; and

(c) if so, the result thereof?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) The matter is being examined in consultation with the Railway Ministry.

Engineering Concerns in Calcutta

*278-A. **Shri Indrajit Gupta:**
Dr. Ranen Sen:
Shri J. M. Biswas:

Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that several large-scale Engineering concerns in the Calcutta area propose to retrench a total of over 5,000 workers on the plea of shortage of Government orders, raw materials and components,

(b) whether any action has been taken in consultation with the Indian Engineering Association to enable such firms to work at full capacity and to avoid closures and lay-offs, and

(c) how far these signs of recession in the Engineering industry are the consequence of devaluation?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) Reports have been received regarding retrenchment of some workers by the Engineering concerns in Calcutta area. The Government have also received a communication from the West Bengal Government that for want of orders for Railway Wagon one Engineering Company is likely to retrench about 2,000 workers.

(b) and (c) The matter is under examination.

C.B.I. Report on Former Orissa Ministers

*279. **Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedy:**
Shri Nath Pai:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any official request has ever been made by the State Govern-

ment of Orissa for a copy of the C.B.I. report on allegations against the former Orissa Ministers;

(b) whether the present Chief Minister has asked for a copy of the report; and

(c) if so, the objections, if any, Government have in supplying a copy to the Government of Orissa?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Yes, Sir. The matter is under consideration.

Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry

*280. **Shri Deven Sen:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received the recommendations made by the Central Wage Board for the Coal Mining Industry;

(b) if so, when;

(c) whether Government have accepted the recommendations, and

(d) if not, when a decision is likely to be taken?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) In February, 1967.

(c) and (d). The recommendations of the Board are under the consideration of the Government. The decision will bebb announced as soon as posible.

Prohibition

*281. **Shri Mohsin:**
Shri Chintamani Panigrahi:
Shri Vasudevan Nair:
Shri C. Janardhanan:
Shri P. C. Adichan:
Shri K. Lakkappa:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some of the States have scrapped prohibition; and

(b) the policy of the Central Government in this regard and how Government intend to implement the same?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b). Information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House.

C.B.I. Report on Orissa Affairs

*282. **Shri Bahurao Patel:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that on the 3rd March, 1965 a document described as the C.B.I. report was laid on the Table of the House by a Member;

(b) whether it made damaging revelations about the alleged malpractices committed by the two former Chief Ministers of Orissa;

(c) whether it is a fact that the late Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had promised to take legal action against them;

(d) whether such action has been taken;

(e) if so, the nature and details thereof; and

(f) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. A document described as the C.B.I. report was laid on the Table of the House by a member. It made certain allegations against former Chief Minister of Orissa.

(c) to (f). Attention is invited to the answers given to the Starred Question No. 175 in Lok Sabha on 23rd February, 1966 and to Unstarred Question No. 157 on 2nd November, 1966. The position remains unchanged.

Special Agency for Disposal of Tax Matters

*282-A. **Shri S. R. Damani:** Will the Ministe rof **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government was contemplating the establishment of a

special agency for disposing of the tax matters pertaining to writs and appeals in Law courts;

(b) if so, the broad details thereof;

(c) if not, at which stage the consideration of such a proposal is pending?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) to (c). *There is* no such proposal yet before the Government. Owing to constant increase in the litigation and the complexity of tax laws, the former Law Minister, Shri G. S. Pathak, had an idea of having a Central Tax Court, which would decide taxation cases especially under the Central Acts.

Allocation for Education in the Fourth Plan

*283. **Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state·

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the statement made by Dr V. K. R. V. Rao, that reduced allocations for education in the States' Fourth Five Year Plan as approved by the Planning Commission will adverse'y affect the programmes of qualitative improvement particularly at the primary and secondary levels;

(b) whether Dr. Rao had further suggested that by cutting down of strategic programmes, the objective of linking education with production would not be achieved; and

(c) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

(c) We have represented to the Planning Commission that the original allocation of Rs. 1210 crores for education should not be reduced The decision of the Planning Commission on the statement of Dr. Rao is also awaited.

Telegraph/Telephone Services

*284 **Shri Surendra Kumar Tapariah**
Shri D. S. Patil:
Shri A. V Patil:

Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the public discontent in regard to (i) the operational inefficiency, both mechanical and manual, of the telephone, telegraph and the telecommunication services in the country and (ii) the discourteous attending of the operating staff, particularly Trunk operators; and

(b) if so, the steps taken to improve the standard of operation of these services?

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri I. K. Gujral):

(a) (i) Complaints are received but these are not many compared to the magnitude of the services rendered.

(ii) Such complaints are very few

(b) Besides investigation and remedial action for each individual case of complaint attention is given to training and supervision of staff as well as maintenance of line and equipment With the introduction of *advanced technology in local and* trunk communication service the standard of service is expected to improve progressively.

Recommendations of Education Commission Report

*285. **Shri Vasudevan Nair:**
Shri C. Janardhanan:
Shri P. C. Adichan:

Will the Minister of **Education** be be pleased to state:

(a) whether any comments had been asked for from the State Governments on the Education Commission Report;

(b) if so, the number of State Governments which have offered their comments; and

(c) the steps being taken to implement the recommendations?

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) So far, comments have been received from the State Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Kerala, Madras, Orissa and Uttar Pradesh. The comments of the other State Governments are awaited.

(c) A programme for implementing the Report of the Education Commission has been drawn up. The Education Minister would be paying visits to several States for individual discussions with State Governments. A Conference of State Education Ministers is being convened on April 28 and 29. A Committee of Members of Parliament is being set up to consider the Report and a discussion thereon will be raised in the next session of Parliament. In the light of these discussions, it is proposed to take decisions on the major recommendations of the Commission and to draw up a programme for immediate action. To the extent financial resources permit, steps to implement this programme will be taken from 1967-68 itself.

Urdu as second Language in Bihar

*286. **Shri K. R. Ganesh:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Bihar Government have made a policy statement making Urdu as the second official language of the State and

(b) whether there is a proposal under the consideration of Government to ask other State Governments to make Urdu as their second official language, where there is a substantial Urdu speaking population?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) In his Address to the new State Legislature on 17th March, 1967, the Bihar Governor stated that recognition would be given to Urdu as the second official language in the State.

(b) No Sir.

Booking of Telegrams at Jaipur.

*287. **Dr. Karni Singh:** Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that telegrames tendered by the Opposition Leaders in Rajasthan at Jaipur on the 8th March, 1967 were not booked;

(b) whether Government are aware that such important telegrams could be transmitted only with the assistance rendered by the authorities in Delhi on that day; and

(c) the reasons for the restrictions so imposed by the Posts and Telegraphs Department causing sudden inconvenience to the public?

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri I. K. Gujaral (a) and (b). No Sir.

(c) Transmission of some telegrams after booking was however, withheld on the 9th March, 67 under section 5(i) (b) of the Indian Telegraph Act.

Pandey Commission Report on Bastar Incidents

*288. **Shri Nath Pai:**
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Ram Singh:
Shri Narain Sarup Sharma:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received a copy of the Pandey Commission Report on the incidents of Jagdalpur (Bastar);

(b) whether Government have studied the Report; and

(c) whether a copy of the Report will be laid on the Table of the House?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Since the Commission was appointed by the state Government it is for them to consider the report.

(c) In view of the fact that the report has already been made public by the Government of Madhya prodesh, it is not proposed to lay a copy on the Table of the House. A few copies will, however, be made available to the library.

गो-हत्या विरोधी आन्दोलन

*288-क. श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) गो-हत्या विरोधी आन्दोलन और इस उद्देश्य के लिये कुछ प्रमुख महात्माओं द्वारा किये गये अनशन के बारे में वर्तमान स्थिति क्या है ;

(ख) क्या सरकार ने इस बारे में अब तक कोई निर्णय किया है और यदि हां, तो क्या निर्णय किया है ; और

(ग) जो राज्य गो-हत्या पर पूर्णतया रोक लगाने के पक्ष में नहीं है उनको इस सम्बन्ध में राजी करने में कितना समय लगने की सम्भावना है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) अनशन समाप्त कर दिये गये हैं किन्तु आन्दोलन जारी है ।

(ख) सरकार ने 5 जनवरी 1967 को जारी किये गये एक वक्तव्य में गो रक्षा के प्रश्न पर विचार करने के लिये एक समिति स्थापित करने के निर्णय की घोषणा कर दी है । इस समिति के सदस्यों के नाम तथा उसके निर्देश पदों की घोषणा जल्दी ही कर दी जाएगी ।

(ग) ऐसे राज्यों से सम्पर्क स्थापित करने की शीघ्र चेष्टा की जाएगी ।

Postal Marks

510. Dr. Karni Singh: Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the postal marks (Seals) of the Delhi Post Offices are so worn out that even the date of posting cannot be read clearly; and

(b) if so, the steps taken to improve the matters?

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri I. K. Gujral): (a) As a rule, worn out stamps are replaced as soon as they become unfit for use. However, the main cause for illegible impressions is due to the fact that some officials do not take sufficient care in obtaining clear and legible impressions particularly during rush periods.

(b) The following steps have been taken:

(i) Detailed instructions have been issued to heads of offices to check the condition of stamps periodically and to ensure that they are regularly oiled and cleaned.

(ii) A machine has been devised to clean stamps and this machine has been supplied to a number of large offices.

(iii) Heads of offices have been asked to exercise proper supervision on the work of those who are entrusted with the stamping duties.

(iv) Action is also being taken to ensure that the stamps and seals manufactured by the Postal Stamps and Seals Co-operative Society, Aligarh, are of the requisite standard.

(v) Special drives are also being conducted from time to time to check whether impressions of stamps are legible and clear.

Promotions in the Central Hindi Directorate

511. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta:
Shri Yashpal Singh:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether some promotions for the posts of Upper Division Clerks were made in the Central Hindi Directorate in 1961 against the orders of the Ministry of Home Affairs;

(b) if so, whether any action has been taken against the officer concerned who committed this irregularity;

(c) whether any benefit of seniority or otherwise has been given to the persons who were adversely affected on account of these irregular promotions; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Prof. Sher Singh): (a) In 1961, a few posts of Upper Division Clerks in the Central Hindi Directorate were filled by promotion of Lower Division Clerks on the basis of seniority-cum-fitness. The seniority list had been prepared by the Directorate tentatively in accordance with the instructions issued by the Ministry of Home Affairs in the year 1949. It later transpired that the Ministry of Home Affairs had revised those instructions. The seniority list was accordingly reviewed in the light of the revised instruction in consultation with the Ministry of Home Affairs and a fresh seniority list was drawn up. The promotions made earlier on the basis of the old tentative seniority list were thereafter reviewed and persons promoted according to the revised seniority list.

(b) It was bonafide mistake and the question of taking any action against any officer was not considered necessary.

(c) and (d). The promotees have been given seniority from the date of their promotion. A few persons have, however, represented in the matter and their representations are under active consideration.

Grants to Political Sufferers

512. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of applications received from the political sufferers in Orissa for grants by the Central Government during the last four months; and

(b) the amount of financial assistance provided to them during the same period?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Three.

(b) Rs 300/- granted to one of them.

Strength of Judges of High Courts

513. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the total strength of High Court Judges in India at present; and

(b) the number of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes amongst them?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) 222 as on 1st April, 1967.

(b) Government do not keep any record of the caste to which a High Court Judge belongs.

Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Candidates Registered in Employment Exchanges

514. **Shri Dhuleshwar Meena.**
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Will the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation be pleased to state·

(a) the number of candidates belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes registered with the various Employment Exchanges in Orissa as on the 31st December, 1965; and

(b) the number out of them provided with employment assistance upto the end of December, 1966?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). Information is given below:—

Category of applicants	No on Live Register as on 31-12-66	No. placed in employment during Jan.-December, 1966
Scheduled Castes .	6,473	1,899
Scheduled Tribes .	8,294	1,625

Deposits in Post Offices

515. **Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:**
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state the amount of gross deposits in various Post Offices of Orissa under the scheme of Small Savings Drive as on the 31st December, 1966?

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri I. K. Gujral): The total amount of gross deposits made under various small savings schemes in all the Post Offices in Orissa as on 31-12-66 is not readily available. However, the total amount of deposits during the period from 1-4-66 to 31-12-66 is Rs. 8,48,,80,000 and the amount of Net Deposits for the same period is Rs. 2,20,15,000.

Agricultural and Plantation Workers' Trade Unions

516. **Shri S. C. Jha:** Will the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the present number of the agricultural and plantation workers in the country; and

(b) the number of Trade Unions representing the agricultural and plantation workers?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). The present number of agricultural and plantation workers and the Trade Unions representing them is not readily available. However, the information available is given below:—

(i) No. of agricultural workers as per Census of India, 1961 .	3·15 crores
(ii) No. of plantation workers as per Census of India 1961 .	11·90 lakhs
(iii) No. of Trade Unions representing agricultural workers .	247
(iv) No. of Trade Unions representing plantation workers .	130

पोस्ट कार्ड की कीमत में कमी

517. श्री दे० सि० पाटिल :
श्री वसवन्त :

श्री तु० ग्र० पाटिल :
श्री कांबले :

क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार ने पोस्ट कार्ड की कीमत 6 पैसे से घटाकर 5 पैसे करने का निर्णय किया है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इसके परिणामस्वरूप सरकार को प्रति वर्ष राजस्व के रूप में कितनी हानि होने की संभावना है ?

संसद्-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल) : (क) जी नहीं।

(ख) प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता।

हिन्दी टेलीप्रिंटरों का निर्माण

518. श्री दे० शि० पाटिल :
श्री बसवन्त :
श्री तु० ग्र० पाटिल :
श्री कांबले :

क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) हिन्दी टेलीप्रिंटरों का निर्माण करने तथा हिन्दुस्तान टेलीप्रिंटर्स लिमिटेड की क्षमता बढ़ाने के मामले में क्या प्रगति हुई है ; और

(ख) प्रति वर्ष कितने टेलीप्रिंटर बनाये जायेंगे ?

संसद्-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल) : (क) और (ख). 1970–71 तक विभिन्न अवस्थाओं में हिन्दुस्तान टेलीप्रिंटर्स लिमिटेड की उत्पादन क्षमता को प्रति वर्ष 1300 अदद टेलीप्रिंटर मशीनें बनाने से बढ़ाकर 8500 अदद टेलीप्रिंटर मशीनें बनाने तक कर देने का विस्तार-कार्यक्रम कम्पनी ने आरम्भ कर दिया है तथा संतोषजनक प्रगति कर रहा है। 1966–67 के वर्ष में 2600 से अधिक टेलीप्रिंटरों के निर्माण की आशा है। 1966-68 के वर्ष के लिये 3500 अदद टेलीप्रिंटर मशीनें बनाने का लक्ष्य रखा गया है।

हिन्दी टेलीप्रिंटरों के निर्माण के लिये हिन्दुस्तान टेलीप्रिंटर्स लिमिटेड अपने इटालीय सहयोगियों सर्व श्री आलिवेत्ती से इटालीय उधार के अधीन औज़ारों और जानकारी की पूर्ति का एक संविदा करने के विषय में बात-चित कर रहा है।

जम्मू और काश्मीर तथा दिल्ली के बीच सीधी टेलीफोन व्यवस्था

519. श्री दे० शि० पाटिल :
श्री बसवन्त :
श्री तु० ग्र० पाटिल :
श्री कांबले :

क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) जम्मू और काश्मीर को दिल्ली से सीधी टेलीफोन व्यवस्था द्वारा मिलाने के काम में कितनी प्रगति हुई है ; और

(ख) इस सेवा के कब तक चालू हो जाने की संभावना है ?

संचार-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल) : (क) जालन्धर-जम्मू तथा श्रीनगर के बीच सूक्ष्मतरंग प्रणाली लगाने का काम पूरा हो चुका है और इस प्रणाली को चालू करने के परीक्षण हो रहे हैं। इस प्रणाली पर उपलब्ध हुए परिपथों से दिल्ली-श्रीनगर, दिल्ली-जम्मू तथा जम्मू-श्रीनगर मार्गों पर उपभोक्ता ट्रंक डायलिंग सेवा चालू करना संभव हो जाएगा।

(ख) दो से तीन महीने तक।

पोस्टल स्टोर डिपो

520. श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : क्या संचार मत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या डाक व तार विभगग ने अपने पोस्टल स्टोर डिपो का पुनर्गठन किया है ,

(ख) क्या अलीगढ, नासिक रोड और कलकत्ता के स्टोर डिपो को अलग एकक घोषित किया गया है ; और

(ग) यदि हा तो पटना, मुजफ्फरपुर, लखनऊ और अन्य स्थानो के स्टोर डिपो को अलग अलग एक घोषित न किये जाने के क्या कारण है ?

ससद-कार्य विभाग तथा सचार विभाग में राज्य मत्री (श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल) : (क) जी हा, दिल्ली और जम्मू तथा काश्मीर सर्कलो को छोड कर ।

(ख) जी हा ।

(ग) ये डिपो भी अलग अलग यूनिटे है, किन्तु चूकि उनकी सिब्बन्दी छोटी होती है, अत पडौस के डाक-मण्डलो से कर्मचारी ले लिये जाते है जब कि अलीगढ, नासिक रोड और कलकत्ता मे ऐसा नही है ।

New Schools opened by N D.M C.

521. Shri Eswara Reddy: Will the **Minister of Education** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of new schools opened by the New Delhi Municipal Committee during the years 1965-66 and 1966-67 and the details thereof; and

(b) the reasons for not opening more new schools in 1966-67?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) 1965-66 2 Schools:

1 M B Primary School Uttar Railway Colony, Sardar Patel Marg, New Delhi, and
2 M B Primary School No 5 Kidwai Nagar, New Delhi

1966-67 Nil

(b) The enrolment position in 1966-67 did not warrant the need for opening any new school.

Merger of New Delhi Schools

522. Shri Eswara Reddy. Wil the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state

(a) the number of schools managed by the New Delhi Municipal Committee in 1966-67 and the number of children studying in these schools,

(b) whether there is a proposal to merge various schools in the same locality into one school and if so the reasons therefor

(c) whether teachers and Headmasters of these schools have objected to such a merger on the ground that after merger, the number of children in each schools will be un-manageable, and

(d) if so the decision taken in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad). (a) Number of schools 81

Number of children attending 26 753

(b) Yes, Sir 8 Primary schools are to be merged with effect from 1-5-1967 This is being done in order to reduce the number of tented schools, minimise overhead expenditure and to have effective control and supervisin over the school children

(c) No, Sir

(d) Question does not arise

Schools in New Delhi Area

523. Shri Eswara Reddy: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of schools in New Delhi area managed by the Delhi Municipal Corporation and the Delhi Administration; and

(b) whether all these schoo s work in double shifts?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) Delhi Municipal Corporation: 428 schools.

Delhi Administration: 69 schools

(b) No, Sir, the number of schools working in double shifts is as follows:—

Delhi Municipal Corporation: 401 schools.

Delhi Administration: 28 schools.

Christian Missionaries in India

524. Shri Baburao Patel: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Christian missions and missionaries in India;

(b) the different countries from where they have come;

(c) the names of the countries and amount of funds received by these missionaries;

(d) the number of Hindus converted by these missionaries, State-wise, during the last five years;

(e) the districts where these missionaries have been extra active;

(f) the steps taken to stop mass conversions in the country; and

(g) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) The number of recognised foreign missions and that of foreign Christian Missionaries registered in India as on 1st January, 1966 was 114 and 4,214 respectively.

(b) Almost all the countries of the world.

(c) A statement giving information for the year 1965, which is the latest available, is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-242/67.]

(d) and (e). There is no law providing for the registration of conversions from one re'igion to another. The information asked for according to religion, States or regions is not therefore, available. However, 8305 persons are resorted to have been baptised or converted into Christianity since 1962.

(f) No instance of mass conversions have come to notice.

(g) Does not arise.

धनबाद की कोयला खानों सम्बन्धी औद्योगिक समिति

525. **श्री राम सिंह :**
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :

क्या श्रम तथा पुनर्वास मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि धनबाद की कोयला खानों सम्बन्धी औद्योगिक समिति ने अपना प्रतिवेदन दे दिया है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उनका ब्यौरा क्या है; और

(ग) इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ?

श्रम तथा पुनर्वास मंत्री (श्री हाथी) : (क) और (ख). एक विवरण, जिसमें धनबाद में 30 जनवरी 1967 को हुए कोयला खनन सम्बन्धी औद्योगिक समिति के 10वें अधिवेशन के मुख्य निर्णय दिये गये हैं, आज लोक सभा की मेज पर रखा जा रहा है ।

(घ) ये निर्णय सब सम्बन्धित पक्षों की आवश्यक कार्यवाही के लिए भेज दिये गये हैं ।

Schools run by Christian Missions

526. Shri Baburao Patel: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of schools run by the Christian Missionaries in India;

(b) the number and names of those among them that get State aid;

(c) the total amount of State aid given to such schools;

(d) whether these Mission-owned schools insist on teaching Christian prayers and the Catechism to the non-Christian children; and

(e) if so, the number of such schools?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) to (e). The information is being obtained and will be laid on the Table of the House

Firing at Imphal

527. Shri M. Meghachandra: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 737 on the 8th December, 1965 and state whether Government have taken any decision, in pursuance of the Mitra Commission report to take action against those Officers who were held responsible for the firing at Imphal on the 27th August, 1965?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): A case has been registered by the Central Bureau of Investigation, under section 302/304/304A/307 and 308 IPC read with section 34 IPC, against officers and men of 1st battalion Manipur Rifles, in respect of the second firing in which one Waikhon Nilmani Singh, died. The investigation of the case is in progress

आनन्द मार्ग संस्था

528. श्री विभूति मिश्र :
श्री क० मा० तिवारी :
श्री शशि रंजन :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) क्या यह सच है कि 'आनन्द मार्ग' नामक एक नई धार्मिक संस्था तथा राजनीतिक संस्था देश मे काम कर रही हैं ,

(ख) यदि हा, तो क्या सरकार को यह पता है कि इस संस्था के संस्थापक तथा आयोजक श्री प्रभात रंजन सरकार (आनन्द मूर्ति) जमालपुर मे पूर्व रेलवे के किसी कार्यालय मे काम करते हैं ,

(ग) क्या उन्होने इस सस्था मे काम करने के लिए सरकार से अनुमति ली थी, और

(घ) क्या सरकार को इस बात का पता है कि इस सस्था ने हाल के आम चुनावों मे स्वतन्त्र उम्मीदवारो के रूप मे अपने उम्मीदवार खडे किये थे ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) (क) सरकार को आनन्द मार्ग के नाम से पुकारी जाने वाली एक सस्था के बारे मे पता है ।

(ख) से (घ) आवश्यक जाच की जा रही है ।

Attack by Nagas on Chandel Headquarters

529. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Naga Hostiles equipped with automatic weapons made a surprise attack on Chandel Headquarters of the Tengnuopal Sub-division of Manipur bordering upper Burma on the 22nd February, 1967;

(b) if so, the facts of the incident; and

(c) the action taken in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b). On the 22nd February, 1967 at 0325 hours about forty Naga hostiles attacked Tengnuopal Sub-division Headquarters at Chandel by opening fire from all directions. The fire was returned by the Manipur Rifles and police and the exchange of fire continued till 0539 hours. There were no casualties on our side

(c) A case has been registered at Chandel Police Station and investigation is proceeding.

Transfer of Files from Punjab Courts to Himachal Pradesh

530. **Shri Hem Raj:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that on the reorganisation of Punjab, the Judicial and Revenue files relating to the Punjab Hill Areas which have been merged with Himachal Pradesh have not been transferred to Himachal Pradesh from the Punjab Courts;

(b) whether it is also a fact that litigants in Himachal Pradesh are suffering as decision on their cases cannot be taken in the absence of these files; and

(c) if so, the reasons for the files not being transferred to Himachal Pradesh?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

Cochin Dock Labour Board

531. **Shri Indrajit Gupta:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Kerala High Court has issued an injunction against the Cochin Dock Labour Board restraining the Board from implementing its decision of the 8th December, 1966 holding workers, who were on strike, as having abandoned employment;

(b) whether the Central Industrial Relations machinery had earlier advised the Cochin Dock Labour Board against the above decision; and

(c) the action taken to prevent the Cochin Dock Labour Board from implementing this illegal decision?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) The Kerala High Court had issued an injunction on the 17th January, 1967 but later it was vacated on the 6th March, 1967. The Union then filed an appeal which was also dismissed on the 27th March, 1967.

(b) No

(c) The Cochin Dock Labour Board was advised to dispose of the question of action against the striking workers under the Standing Orders as early as possible In terms of its decision on 25th March 1967, the Board has taken back the workers who were on strike from 1st to 8th December, 1966.

Dumps of Arms and Ammunition Unearthed in Kashmir

532. **Shri Yashpal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that during the last week of December, 1966, Central Reserve Police unearthed arms and ammunition dumps in Kashmir; and

(b) if so, the steps taken to stop such infiltration of ammunition?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) No, Sir;

(b) Guarding of CFL/border by the security forces and vigilance.

U.S. Loan for Technical Institutes

533. **Shri Yashpal Singh:** Will the Minister of Education be pelased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2627 on the 30th November, 1966 and state the progress so far made in the negotiations for a loan from the Government of U.S.A. to meet the requirements of technical institutes in respect of procurement of equipments manufactured in that country?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): The United States Agency for International Development has authorised a loan of $ 12 million for procurement of equipment etc. from the U.S.A. The draft loan agreement is being discussed with the U.S. authorities.

Levy on Industry for Financing Technical Education

534. **Shri Yashpal Singh:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2624 on the 30th November, 1966 and state·

(a) whether the recommendation regarding the levy on industry to raise funds for financing technical education has since been considered by Government; and

(b) if so, the decision taken thereon?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Theft of Cars and Scooters in Delhi

535. **Shri Yashpal Singh:**
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that cases of theft of cars and scooters have considerably increased in the capital during the last three months;

(b) the number of cars/scooters stolen during this period;

(c) the steps taken to check this menace; and

(d) the number of persons arrested in this connection?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b). While there has been some increase in the cases of car thefts, the number of scooter thefts has gone down appreciably during the period from 1st December, 1966 to 28th February, 1967 as compared with the corresponding periods of 1965 and 1966. The relevant statistics are given below:—

Period	*No. of cars stolen*	*No. of Scooters stolen*
1-12-65 to 28-2-66 .	30	47
1-12-66 to 28-2-67 .	36	36

(c) The following steps have been taken to deal with the problem of motor vehicles/scooter thefts:—

(i) The Auto-theft Squad in the Crime Branch of Delhi C.I.D. has been dealing with cases of car thefts since April, 1963. This Squad functions under overall supervision of a Dy Supdt of Police of the Crime Branch and work round-the-clock. As soon as a car theft is reported at a police station or to the Police Control Room, information is passed on immediately to the officers of the Squad who take up investigations. Cases of scooter thefts and thefts of other automobiles are handled in each of the three police districts by a specially earmarked staff.

(ii) Plain clothed men have been detailed in the affected areas

to detect the culprits and also to lay traps.

(iii) Division officers and beat constables of the affected police stations have been instructed to be vigilant.

(iv) Surveillance over the movements of the previous convicts and suspects in car|scooter thefts is being maintained by the Crime Branch with the help of local police.

(v) Intelligence is collected through persons dealing in auto parts and other sources.

(vi) The Delhi Police are in touch with their counterparts in Bombay and Calcutta, for purposes of investigation.

(d) 14 persons have been arrested in car thefts cases and 13 persons in scooter theft cases reported to the police during the period 1st December, 1966 to 28th February 1967.

Employment of Educated and Trained Women

536. Shri S. C. Samanta: Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the statement made by Smt. Durgabai Deshmukh at the meeting of the National Council for Women's Education held on the 8th March, 1967 in New Delhi that 15 lakhs of educated and trained women were sitting idle;

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto;

(c) whether it is also a fact that women, who are trained in the polytechnics are also not finding any employment; and

(d) if so, the steps taken to provide full employment to trained and educated women?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) No country-wide survey in this regard has been made.

(d) The various development schemes in the Five Year Plans are expected to lead to larger employment opportunities for the educated and trained persons including women.

Hindi Classes conducted by the Home Ministry

537. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the number of persons joining Hindi Classes conducted by his Ministry has decreased; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) No, Sir. The number of trainees, which had decreased from 40,500 in October, 1965 to 26,500 in July, 1966 has since then gone up again to 34,500 in October, 1966 for which latest figures are available.

(b) Does not arise.

Explosion of Cracker in Regal Park, New Delhi

538. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a man was arrested on the 27th February, 1967 for cracker explosion in Regal Park, New Delhi where a Jan Sangh Rally was being held;

(b) whether enquiries in to the matter have been completed; and

(c) if so, the action taken in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The investigation is in progress

(c) Does not arise.

Temporary Central Government Employees

540. Shri Hukam Chand Kacchavaiya: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Class III and IV Government Employees in the various Ministries who have put in more than three years service in their particular grade but are still temporary;

(b) the number of Government Employees who have been working as L.D.Cs. for the last ten years but who have not been promoted; and

(c) the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) to (c). The requisite information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

गोआ के बारे में निर्णय

541. श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या गोआ, दमन और दीव क्षेत्रों को वहां पर राय जानने के लिये हुए मतदान के आधार पर संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में रखने के बारे में अन्तिम निर्णय कर लिया गया है ; और

(ख) गोआ को आर्थिक रूप से आत्म-निर्भर बनाने के लिए क्या प्रयत्न किये जा रहे हैं ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण): (क) 'राय जानने के लिये' होने वाले मतदान के परिणाम पर विचार करके भारत सरकार ने गोआ, दमन और दीव को संघ राज्य क्षेत्र बनाये रखने का निश्चय किया है ।

(ख) विभिन्न दिशाओं में गोआ विकास विभिन्न पंच वर्षीय योजनाओं में बनाई गई योजनाओं के अनुसार हो रहा है ।

Indo-American Educational Foundation

542. Shri C. C. Desai:
Shri Nath Pai:
Shri R. Barua:

Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the proposal to set up an Indo-American Educational Foundation in India has been shelved:

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) if not, the upto-date progress regarding the setting up of the Foundation?

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): (a) to (c). There has been no discussion or correspondence on the subject between the Governments of India and the United States of America in recent months. The position remains the same as stated in reply to Question No. 63 on 27th July, 1966 in the House.

Indiscipline among Students

543. Shri C. C. Desai:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri M. V. Rajasekharan:
Shri R. Barua:
Shri D. N. Patodia:
Shri Ram Charan:

Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any steps have been taken by Government to check growing indiscipline among the students in the country; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and the results achieved so far?

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): A statement giving the required information is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-243/67].

Administrative Reforms Commission

544. **Shri C. C. Desai:**
Shri N. C. Chatterjee:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri P. K. Ghosh:
Shri Yashpal Singh:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
Shri K. N. Tiwary:
Shri S. Supakar:
Shri Ram Kishan Gupta:
Shri P. K. Deo:
Shri G. C. Naik:
Shri K. P. Singh Deo:
Shri A. Dipa:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the upto-date progress made by the Administrative Reforms Commission appointed by the Government to streamline administration in the country;

(b) when the Commission is likely to submit its final report to Government; and

(c) the action taken so far on the recommendations contained in the Interim Report of the Commission?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) The Administrative Reforms Commission has constituted 18 study teams and 3 working groups for making intensive studies and reporting on various subjects taken up for examination. In addition' 14 such groups have also been constituted by several States for assisting the Commission' So far reports from three study teams have been received by the Commission; most of the remaining are expected to be received by the end of May 1967. The Commission has submitted an interim report on the rederess of public grievances' and expects to send another on the machinery for planning during April' 1967.

(b) It is not possible to give a firm date at this stage, but the Commission aims to complete its work by about the end of 1967.

(c) Attention is invited to paragraph 14 of the President's Address to Parliament on the 18th March 1967, which states the present position in regard to the interim report of the Commission.

National Commission on Labour

545. **Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether National Commission on Labour has started functioning; and

(b) if so, the progress made by it?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes.

(b) The Commission has held two meetings so far. It has decided on its line of inquiry and drawn up the programme of work. The Commission hopes to submit its report to Government by the 31st December, 1968

संस्कृत का विकास

546. **श्री रघुवीर सिंह शास्त्री :** क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में संस्कृत के विकास के लिये निर्धारित धनराशि के आधार पर संस्कृत के विकास की योजना की रूपरेखा तैयार कर ली गई है ;

(ख) क्या यह सच है कि इस योजना में संस्कृत की पांडुलिपियों के प्रकाशन तथा उनके सम्बन्ध में शीघ्र कार्य करने के लिये धन की व्यवस्था की जायेगी ;

(ग) क्या योजना में निर्धारित धनराशि को बढ़ाने के सम्बन्ध में सरकार को कोई प्रस्ताव प्राप्त हुआ है ; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो उसके बारे में सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री० शेर सिंह) : (क) और (ख). जी हां।

(ग) जी नहीं।

(घ) प्रश्न नहीं उठता।

Synthetic Protein from Coal

547. Dr. P. Mondal:
Shri S. C. Samanta:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the report that the Dutch laboratories have developed synthetic protein from coal; and

(b) whether Government are exploring the possibilities of experimentation of the process in the country?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) Yes, Sir

(b) At present there is no experimental programme in this regard

Shiv Sena, Bombay

548 Shri A. K. Gopalan:
Shri Umanath:
Shri Nambiar:
Shri Indulal Yajnik:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government was drawn to the activities of the Shiv Sena against the non-Maharashtrians residing in Bombay city.

(b) if so, whether Government consider the activities of this organisation detrimental to the concept of national integration; and

(c) the steps taken by Government to protect the non-Maharashtrians in the State in view of the possibilities of its repercussions in other States?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) The Government have received a number of letters about the activities of the Shiv Sena. They have also seen some Press reports in this connection.

(b) and (c). The Government are ascertaining the facts from the Government of Maharashtra

Indian Migrants from Burma

549. Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation be pleased to atate:

(a) the number of migrants of Indian origin from Burma during the last three months; and

(b) the steps taken to rehabilitate them?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) 3,515 repartiates from Burma have arrived since 1st December, 1966

(b) A statement indicating the rehabilitation measures taken and schemes sanctioned for the repartriates from Burma is laid on the Table of House. [*Placed in Library. See* No LT-244/67.]

Posting of C.P.W.D. Personnel in Himachal Pradesh

550. Shri Hem Raj: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state·

(a) whether it is a fact that a Circular [No F-18|19|65 DH(S), dated the 19th October, 1966] was issued by his Ministry to the effect that the C P.W.D. personnel were liable to be transferred to the Himachal Pradesh Union Territory;

(b) whether it is also a fact that this Circular has created dissatisfaction amongst the P W D. Staff of that territory as it will deprive the Assistant Engineers of that Territory to get their promotion after the integration of the Punjab Hill Areas; and

(c) if so, whether Government propose to keep out Himachal Pradesh from the operation of that Circular?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) According to Circular No. F-18/19/65-DH(S) dated the 19th October, 1966, 50% of the posts of Assistant Engineers and 75% of the posts of Executive Engineers and above are to be filled by deputation from the Central Public Works Department, Central Water & Power Commission and States.

(b) The Himachal Pradesh Engineers' Association have represented that vacancies should be filled up by promotion of engineers belonging to the Himachal Pradesh administration.

(c) The matter is under consideration.

Fourth Plan Allocation for Dandakaranya Project

551. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Will the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) the provisions made for Dandakaranya Project in the year 1967-68;

(b) whether the original provision of rupees 30 crores in the Fourth Plan period has been revised now; and

(c) if so, to what extent?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) Rs. 4·50 crores.

(b) & (c). Yes. Sir. The original provision of Rs. 30 crores is proposed to be revised to Rs. 27 crores.

Post Offices to be Opened in Orissa.

552. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Will the Minister of Communications be pleased to state the number of new post offices proposed to be opened in Orissa State during 1967-68 and their location?

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri I. K. Gujral): Owing to the financial stringency certain restrictions have been imposed on the opening of new Extra Departmental Branch Post offices. In case these are removed 100 Extra Departmental Branch Offices are proposed to be opened in 1967-68. 12 departmental Sub Offices are also likely to be established. The proposed location of 77 offices is furnished in the statement laid on the Table of House. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-245/67]. The remaining proposals are yet to be finalised.

Assistance to Primary Schools

553. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2198 on the 23rd November, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the matter regarding the pattern of Central assistance to be given to the States for Primary Schools during the Fourth Five Year Plan has since been considered; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) and (b). The pattern of assistance to be given to State Governments under Elementary Education has since been decided as follows:—

	Pattern of Assistance
I. *Centrally Sponsored Schemes*	
Teacher Training (Elementary):	
Correspondence Courses .	100%
II. *Centrally Sponsored Schemes agreed to be transferred to State Sector*	
Teachers' Training:	
Elementary Education—Improvement programmes .	50%
III. *Centrally Aided Schemes*	
General Education:	
Special Schemes for Girls Education . . .	75%
Improvement of Science in middle Schools . .	75%
Teacher's Training (Elementary and Secondary) . .	75%
Other Schemes . .	40%

कृष्णनगर, पश्चिम बंगाल में पाकिस्तानी परिवार

554. **श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :** क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि नदिया जिले के कृष्णनगर में अब भी बड़ी संख्या मे पाकिस्तानी परिवार अवैध रूप से रहते हैं ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि मार्च, 1967 मे ऐसे अनेक परिवारों को गिरफ्तार किया गया था , और

(ग) यदि हा, तो इन परिवारों को पाकिस्तान वापस भेजने अथवा उस स्थान से हटाने के लिए क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) और (ख) जी, नही ।

(ग) प्रश्न ही नही उठता ।

Continuance of English

555 **Shri Nath Pai:**
Shri S. Supakar:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state·

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the statement made by the Chief Minister of Madras that he will approach the Union Government for amending the Constitution to provide for the continuance of English as an associate language;

(b) whether the Madras Government have sent any proposal to this effect; and

(c) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Government have already announced that legislation to give statutory recognition to the assurances given in regard to the Official Lunguage of the Union will be shortly introduced in Parliament.

Department of Youth Services

556. **Shri Ram Kishan:**
Shri Yashpal Singh:
Shri M. V. Raasekharan:

Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state·

(a) whether a new department of Youth Services is being created in his Ministry to mobilize young people for constructive activities; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): (a) and (b) A Division of Youth Services has been created in the Ministry of Education

Increase in Crimes in Delhi

557. **Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:**
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been an increase in crimes of violence in Delhi in the last four months; and

(b) if so, the remedial and preventive measures proposed to be taken in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Expansion of Scientific and Technological Research

558. **Shri Ramachandra U'aka:**
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any plan has been formulated for expanding scientific and technological research in India; and

(b) if so, the broad features thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) The plan for expansion of scientific and techonological research as a whole during the Fourth Five Year Plan is yet to be finalised by the Planning Commission.

(b) Does not arise.

Pak. Spies in India

559. Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Pakistani spies continued coming to India during the period from December, 1966 to February, 1967;

(b) the number of those apprehended during the above period; and

(c) whether some Indians have also been apprehended for giving shelter to them?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b). Nineteen persons were arrested during this period on suspicion of spying for Pakistan.

(c) Yes, Sir.

Markets on Assam-East Pak. Border

560. Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Union Government have permitted Assam Government to reopen markets on the Assam-East Pakistan border which were sealed after the conflict with Pakistan in September, 1965; and

(b) if so, the main causes of such arrangements?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Yes, on a very limited scale in respect of selected 'hats' only.

(b) The requirements of the local population necessitated the opening of border 'hats'. A close watch is however, being kept on the traffic with Pakistan in these 'hats'.

बिहार में इंडियन सिविल सर्विस के अधिकारी

561. **श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा :** क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि बिहार सरकार ने इंडियन सिविल सर्विस के सभी अधिकारियों को केन्द्र में वापस भेजने पर जोर दिया है : और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस पर सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) और (ख). जी नहीं । बिहार सरकार से ऐसा सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुआ ।

दिल्ली में हुई हत्यायें

562. **श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा :**
श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :

क्या गृह-कार्य मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) 1966–67 में दिल्ली में कितनी हत्याएं हुई ;

(ख) 1965–66 की तुलना में इनमें कितने प्रतिशत वृद्धि हुई है ; और

(ग) इन्हें रोकने के लिये क्या कार्यवाही की जा रही है ?

पूर्त-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) 67।

(ख) 15 2 प्रतिशत कमी हुई है।

(ग) जब कभी किन्ही दो दलो मे पिछली शत्रुता का पता चल जाता है तब किसी भी प्रकार के अपराध को होने देने से रोकने के लिये दण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता की निवारक धाराओं के अधीन कार्यवाही की जाती है।

डाक और तार विभाग का भवन, कोटा

563. **श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा :** क्या संचार मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) क्या यह सच है कि कोटा, राजस्थान में डाक और तार विभाग के एक बड़े भवन का निर्माण हो रहा है ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि निर्माण कार्य निर्धारित विवरणो के अनुसार नही किया जा रहा है ; और

(ग) यदि हा, तो इसके क्या कारण है और भवन के निर्माण-कार्य को पूरा होने में कितना समय लगने की सम्भावना है ?

संसद्-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री इन्द्रकुमार गुजराल) : (क) जी हा, कोटा, राजस्थान में प्रधान डाकघर व विभागीय तारघर के लिए 7 7 लाख रुपये (लगभग) की लागत से एक इमारत बनाई जा रही है।

(ख) जी नही काम निर्धारित विवरणो के अनुसार ही किया जा रहा है।

(ग) इमारत के दिसम्बर 1967 के अन्त तक पूरा हो जाने की आशा है।

Protection of Ancient Temples and Monuments in Orissa

564. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether any ancient temples and monuments are proposed to be taken over for protection in Orissa in 1967-68; and

(b) the amount allotted for repairs, maintenance and beautifying the ancient protected temples and monuments in Bhubaneswar during the Fourth Plan?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Prof. Sher Singh): (a) Yes, Sir The Chausatti Jogini temple and three adjacent temples at Jharial in Bolangir District of Orissa are under consideration for protection in 1967-68

(b) Conservation and maintenance of protected monuments is a normal activity of the Archaeological Survey of India and funds required for the same are provided from the Survey's annual budget

Cases Referred to C B.I

565. Shri Abdul Ghani Dar: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state

(a) the number of cases referred to the Central Bureau of Investigation during the last one year,

(b) the number of cases decided by the C B I. during the above period, and

(c) the nature of cases referred to the C B.I ?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) The Special Police Establishment took up 2466 fresh cases during 1966

(b) Of the 2466 cases, 1418 cases have been decided as below:—

Sent up for trial in Courts—136.
Reported for regular departmental action—920

Reported for such action as deemed fit by Ministries/Departments—244.

Closed for want of adequate evidence—118.

Remaining 1048 cases are pending enquiry/investigation.

(c) The cases involved allegations relating to bribery, criminal misconduct (showing favours, causing illegal pecuniary advantage, possession of disproportionate assets etc.), misappropriation, cheating, forgery, and departmental misconduct by public servants, and cheating and other malpractices by private persons.

Publication of Encyclopaedia in Regional Languages

566. **Shri Biswanaryan Shastri:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have any scheme for giving financial aid for publication of encyclopaedia in regional languages;

(b) if so, the regional languages which will be covered by the scheme and the amount proposed to be given in each case; and

(c) whether such aid is to be given directly to the institutions concerned or through the State Governments?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Prof. Sher Singh): (a) Under the Scheme of Assistance to Voluntary Organisations for Promotion of Modern Indian Langauges grants are given for preparation and/or publication of encyclopaedias:

(b) All the Modern Indian Languages, other than Hindi and Sanskirt, as set out in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution of India and other recognised languages including tribal languages are covered by the Scheme. The amount of grants is determined on the merits of each case and for approved items only to the extent of 50 per cent of the total approved expenditure.

(c) Grants are given direct to Voluntary Organisations/Institutions but the requests for the same have to come through the State Governments except in the cases of organisations of all India character where the applications may be accepted directly.

Labour Unrest in Neiveli Lignite Corporation

567. **Shri V. Krishnamoorthi:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware of the unrest among the employees of the Neiveli Lignite Corporation; and

(b) if so, the action taken to redress the grievances of the employees?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes.

(b) Some demands of a general nature have been raised by unions other than the one recognised by the management under the Code of Discipline. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Madras has held discussions with the parties with a view to promote a settlement.

Investigation into escape of Political Persons from Orissa

568. **Shri S. Kundu:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of Orissa have sought the assistance of the C.I.B. in investigating the alleged escape of certain political persons from India after the announcement of holding the judicial enquiry by the Orissa Government into corruption charges against certain persons in power in Orissa since 1961; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधीन कैबिनेटों/पार्लियामेंट असिस्टेंटों के पद

569. **श्री राम चरण** : क्या गृह-कार्य मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि उनके मन्त्रालय ने 24 दिसम्बर, 1963 को विभिन्न मन्त्रालयों को एक कार्यालय ज्ञापन संख्या 21/31/63-सी०एस(ए) भेजा था;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उन मन्त्रालयों के क्या नाम हैं जिन्होंने उक्त ज्ञापन के अनुसरण में वहां तीन वर्ष से अधिक समय से काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों का तबादला कर दिया और जिनके स्थान पर अन्य कर्मचारी रखे गये ;

(ग) मन्त्रालयवार ऐसे कितने पद हैं जिन पर यही व्यक्ति तीन वर्ष से अधिक समय से काम कर रहे हैं ; और

(घ) क्या सरकार का विचार विभिन्न मन्त्रालयों को यह आदेश देने का है कि वे उक्त ज्ञापन में दी गई हिदायतों का सख्ती से पालन करें ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) जी हां ।

(ख) से (घ). उक्त ज्ञापन एक सलाह के तौर पर था और यह बात प्रशासकीय मन्त्रालयों के स्वविवेक पर छोड़ दी गई थी कि वे समय-समय पर कोपाध्यक्ष, संसद्-सहायक पदों पर काम करने की अवधि को कार्य की दक्षता को ध्यान में रखते हुए बदल दें । तदनुसार ऐसे मामलों की संख्या के बारे में कोई आंकड़े नहीं रखे गये जिनमें तबादले किये गये या किये जाने हैं । ये पद केन्द्रीय सचिवालय लिपिक सेवा अथवा केन्द्रीय सचिवालय सेवा के सहायक वर्ग में शामिल हैं । जिनका विकेन्द्रीकरण कर दिया गया है । अतः उन पर सम्बन्धित कैडर अधिकारियों अर्थात् सम्बन्धित मन्त्रालय विभाग का नियन्त्रण है ।

स्वायत्तशासी संस्थाओं, आयोगों तथा समितियों द्वारा नियुक्त किये गये सेवा-निवृत्त अधिकारी

570. **श्री राम चरण** : क्या गृह-कार्य मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि 1965-66 और 1966-67 में भारत सरकार के विभिन्न मन्त्रालयों के अधीन स्वायत्तशासी संस्थाओं, आयोगों तथा समितियों में कितने सेवा-निवृत्त राजपत्रित अधिकारी नियुक्त किये गये ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : सूचना एकत्रित की जा रही है और यथाशीघ्र सदन के सभा-पटल पर रख दी जायेगी ।

जनता से हिन्दी में प्राप्त आवेदनपत्रों का निपटारा

571. **श्री राम चरण** : क्या शिक्षा मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि उनके मन्त्रालय में अंग्रेजी में जनता से प्राप्त आवेदन-पत्रों तथा सुझावों पर तुरन्त कार्यवाही की जाती है परन्तु हिन्दी में प्राप्त आवेदन-पत्रों तथा सुझावों की उपेक्षा की जाती है और उनका उत्तर काफी समय के बाद भेजा जाता है ; और

(ख) यदि नहीं, तो अंग्रेजी में प्राप्त हुए आवेदन-पत्र का उत्तर कितने दिन में दिया जाता है तथा हिन्दी में प्राप्त हुए आवेदन-पत्र आदि का उत्तर देने में कितने दिन लगाए जाते हैं ?

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री भागवत झा आजाद) : (क) जी नहीं ।

(ख) सभी प्रकार के आवेदन-पत्रों का उत्तर देने के लिए कोई निश्चित समय सीमा निर्धारित करना सम्भव नहीं है । सामान्यतया अंग्रेजी और हिन्दी के एक जैसे आवेदन-पत्रों के उत्तर देने में लगभग समान समय लगता है ।

राजपत्रित अधिकारियों की पुनः नियुक्ति

573. श्री राम चरण : क्या शिक्षा मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि शिक्षा मन्त्रालय से सेवा निवृत्त हुए बहुत से राजपत्रित अधिकारियों को उस मन्त्रालय के अधीन स्वायत्तशासी निकायों में पुनः नियुक्त किया गया है;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उनकी संख्या क्या है तथा उन्हें किन-किन कार्यालयों में नियुक्त किया गया है ; और

(ग) इन पदों को संघ लोक सेवा आयोग के माध्यम से न भरे जाने के क्या कारण है ?

शिक्षा मंत्री (डा० त्रिगुण सेन) : (क) कुछ सेवानिवृत्त राजपत्रित अधिकारी शिक्षा मन्त्रालय के अधीन स्वायत्तशासी निकायों में पुनः नियुक्त किये गये है ।

(ख) केवल चार । इन्हे निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों मे पुनः नियुक्त किया गया है :—

(i) केन्द्रीय विद्यालय सगठन, नई दिल्ली ।

(ii) तिब्बती स्कूल सोसायटी, नई दिल्ली ।

(iii) केन्द्रीय माध्यमिक शिक्षा बोर्ड, नई दिल्ली ।

(iv) राष्ट्रीय शैक्षिक अनुसन्धान तथा प्रशिक्षण परिषद्, नई दिल्ली ।

(ग) इन संगठनो के पदो पर नियुक्ति सम्बन्धी नियमों के अधीन संघ लोक सेवा आयोग के जरिए पदों को भरना आवश्यक नही है ।

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में हिन्दी का प्रयोग

573. श्री राम चरण : क्या शिक्षा मन्त्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) उनके मन्त्रालय में हिन्दी के प्रयोग के बारे में यदि कोई बाधाएं हैं तो उनको दूर करने के लिये सरकार का क्या कार्यवाही करने का विचार है ;

(ख) उनके मन्त्रालय में अवर सचिव तथा उससे ऊपर के पदों के कितने अधिकारी केवल अंग्रेजी में ही काम करते हैं ; और

(ग) इस स्थिति को सुधारने के लिये सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है अथवा करने का विचार किया है ?

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री भागवत झा आजाद): (क) शिक्षा मन्त्रालय में हिन्दी के प्रयोग में कोई विशेष बाधाएं नहीं हैं ।

(ख) 58 ।

(ग) हिन्दी न जानने वाले अधिकारियों को हिन्दी सीखने के लिए प्रोत्साहित करने के प्रयत्न जारी रखे जा रहे हैं ।

Clash with Mizos on 15-3-1967

574. **Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that one Mizo hostile was killed and six others were captured by the security forces in a few raids in hostile hide-outs in Mizo hills on the 15th and 16th March, 1967; and

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) On the 15th March 1967, one MNF hostile was killed and six hostiles were apprehended on the 16th March, 1967 seven MNF suspects were apprehended by the security forces.

(b) Operations against the hostiles will continue.

काशीपुर में पुरातत्वीय खुदाई

575. श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री राम सिंह :
श्री नारायण स्वरूप शर्मा :

क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि पाण्डवों के किले का पता लगाने के लिए उत्तर प्रदेश में काशीपुर में पुरातत्वीय विभाग द्वारा खुदाई की जा रही है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या इस खुदाई से किले की विद्यमानता के कुछ संकेत मिले हैं, और

(ग) खुदाई कार्य कब तक पूरा हो जाने की सम्भावना है ?

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (प्रो० शेर सिंह) : (क) से (ग). फिलहाल इस स्थल पर कोई खुदाई नहीं की जा रही है। किन्तु दबी हुई इमारत को साफ करने तथा उसका स्वरूप निश्चय करने की दृष्टि से मार्च-जून 1966 में सीमित खुदाई की गई थी परन्तु वहां पर किसी किले के विद्यमान होने का कोई संकेत नहीं मिला।

12 मार्च, 1957 को सिजो लोगों का सिल्चर जेल से भाग जाना

576. श्री राम सिंह :
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री नारायण स्वरूप शर्मा :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि 12 मार्च, 1967 को छः विद्रोही सिजो नेता कचार जिले में सिल्चर जेल से भाग गये थे ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि मार्च के महीने में यह घटना इस प्रकार की दूसरी घटना है ; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो जेल से इस प्रकार भागने की घटनाओं को रोकने के लिये सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) 13 मार्च, 1967 को सिल्चर जेल से 6 सिजो बन्दी भाग निकले थे।

(ख) जी हां।

(ग) राज्य सरकार सुरक्षा प्रबन्धों को मजबूत करने के लिये कदम उठा रही है। जेल में अतिरिक्त कर्मचारी भी नियुक्त किये जा रहे हैं और सिजो बन्दियों को अन्य जेलों को स्थानान्तरण की व्यवस्था की जा रही है।

Upgrading of a School in a Chandigarh Village

577 **Shri Shri Chand Goyel:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Gram Panchayat of Village Maliya of the Union Territory of Chandigarh has represented for the upgrading of its school, and

(b) if so, the decision taken in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) The matter is under active consideration of the Chandigarh Administration

Irregularities in Sangeet Natak Akademi

578 **Shri Baburao Patel:** Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether an inquiry has been instituted regarding the alleged irre-

gularities committed by the former Secretary of the Sangeet Natak Akademi;

(b) if so, the name of the person who conducted the inquiry and the results thereof; and

(c) if the inquiry has not been concluded, the stage at which the matter has reached?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Prof. Sher Singh): (a) to (c). The Special Police Establishment conducted the enquiry which revealed mis-appropriation of Akademi's money by the former Secretary of the Sangeet Natak Akademi. The charge sheet had been filed against her and other two ex-Accountants of the Akademi on 10-8-61 in a Delhi Court. The matter is still pending in the Court of Law .

Allegations against Shri Atulya Ghosh

579. Shri A. K. Gopalan:
Shri Jyotirmoy Basu:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to a recent statement of Puri Sri Sankaracharya involving Shri Atulya Ghosh and demanding investigations in the matter;

(b) whether Government would consider the holding of an enquiry into the matter; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Government have seen press reports of the statement of the Shankaracharya of Puri in this connection.

(b) and (c). A number of criminal cases were instituted in respect of the occurrences of 7th November, 1966. They were thoroughly investigated under the Code of Criminal Procedure and the results of the investigations have been placed before the Courts. No other inquiry is called for.

Mining Engineers

580. Shri A. K. Gopalan:
Shri C. K. Chakrapani:
Shri Jyotirmoy Basu:

Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Mining Engineers who appeared for "exchange certificate examination" from 1962 to 1966 year-wise;

(b) the number out of them who passed in the first chance; and

(c) how many of the failed candidates during that period had their mining education in U.K.?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) 29 appeared in 1962, 43 in 1963, 19 in 1964 and 20 in 1965.

(b) 4 passed in the first chance in 1962, 5 in 1963, 1 in 1964 and 2 in 1965.

(c) Information about the failed candidates who had obtained their University education in mining in U.K is not available. All these candidates had, however, obtained U.K. First Class Managers' Certificate by virtue of practical experience in U.K. mines, where mining conditions are very different from those in India.

मध्य प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय के मुख्य न्यायाधीश की जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धी विवाद

581. डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :
श्री शिवचन्द्र झा :
श्री रबी राय :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि मध्य प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय के मुख्य न्यायाधीश के विरुद्ध यह आरोप लगाया गया है कि उन्होंने अपनी गलत जन्म तिथि लिखाई थी हालांकि उनकी वास्तविक जन्मतिथि उनकी शिक्षा सम्बन्धी कागजात

में दर्ज है और यह तिथि 9 अप्रैल 1905 की बजाय 19 मार्च 1907 लिखाई गई है ;

(ख) यदि हां तो क्या इस झूठ कथन के सम्बन्ध में कोई कार्यवाही की गई है ; और

(ग) यदि हां तो क्या और यदि नहीं तो उसके क्या कारण हैं ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हान): (क) से (ग). राष्ट्रपति को इस आशय का आरोप लगाने वाले कुछ अभ्यावेदन प्राप्त हुए थे कि मध्य प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय के मुख्य न्यायाधीश ने जन्म तिथि ठीक नहीं लिखाई थी। इनके प्राप्त होने पर इस मामले पर उन्होंने भारत के मुख्य न्यायाधीश के साथ परामर्श करके संविधान के अनुच्छेद 217 के अनुसार निर्णय लिया। राष्ट्रपति का निर्णय मध्य प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय के मुख्य न्यायाधीश की जन्म तिथि 19 मार्च 1907 मान लेने का है।

Police verification for appointments in Public Undertakings

532. **Shri C. K. Chakrapani:**
Shri P. Gopalan:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Police verification for appointment and after appointment is still continuing in the following public sector undertakings;

(i) Hindustan Steel Ltd.

(ii) Hindustan Machine Tools.

(iii) Heavy Electricals Bhopal; and

(iv) F.A.C.T., Alwaye.

(b) if so, the total number of persons who failed to maintain their jobs during the last five years;

(c) the number of persons that have been sent out after serving for more than six months during this period in these undertakings;

(d) whether it is a fact that in some States the system of police verification has been abolished, if so, the names of the States,

(e) whether the Central Government propose to abolish this system; and

(f) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) The scheme of verification of character and antecedent of candidates before employment under the Central Government has been introduced to enable the appointing authority to satisfy itself that the candidate is suitable in all respects for such employment This scheme has been adopted by a number of Public Sector Undertakings including those mentioned in part (a) of the question.

(b) and (c). This information will be collected and placed on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

(d) The Government of India have no information, as this falls within the purview of State Governments.

(e) and (f). There is no proposal under consideration for abolishing this system for the reasons stated in reply to part (a) of the question.

U.P.S.C Examination in Regional Languages

533. **Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:**
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Khagapathi Pradhani:
Shri Heerji Bhai:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 59 on the 2nd November, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the Union Public Service Commission has since finalised the formula for holding the Central Services Examinations in all the fourteen languages; and

(b) if so, the salient features thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Not yet, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Payment of Bonus Act, 1965

584. Shri Khagapathi Pradhani:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Hirji Bhai:

Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 3.0 on the 16th November, 1966 regarding Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 and state:

(a) whether the Bipartite Committee held its meeting in January, 1967;

(b) if so, the subjects discussed thereat; and

(c) the decision taken by Government thereon?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Committee considered various proposals for the amendment of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 put forward before the Standing Labour Committee at its meeting held on 26th October, 1966.

(c) No agreement could be reached between the employers' and workers' representative on any of the proposals. The matter will be placed before the Standing Labour Committee at its next session which is proposed to be held on 10th May, 1967.

Attempt on the Life of Kashmir Chief Minister

585. Shri Khagapathi Pradhani:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Hirji Bhai:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 325 on the 16th November, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the investigations regarding the blast of the hand grenade which was fired over the Chief Minister of Kashmir have since been completed; and

(b) if so, the main features thereof?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) No, Sir

(b) Does not arise.

Wage Board for Film Industry

586. Shri Khagapathi Pradhani:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Hirji Bhai:

Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No 328 on the 16th November, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the proposal to set up a Wage Board for the film industry has since been considered; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The composition and the terms of reference of Wage Board are being finalised.

Employment Insurance, Retirement and Family Pension Scheme for Labourers

587. Shri Khagapathi Pradhani:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Hirji Bhai:

Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question

No. 463 on the 23rd November, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the proposals for the introduction of new schemes of employment insurance, retirement and family pension for workers, have since been considered; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) No. The proposals are still under consideration.

(b) The details have not yet been finalised.

Reservation of Posts for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes

589. **Shri Suraj Bhan:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of posts reserved for the scheduled castes in Class I, Class II and Class III (separately) under the Central Government that have been converted as unreserved during the period 26th January, 1950 to 31st December, 1966;

(b) the number of posts reserved for the scheduled tribes in class I, class II and class III (separately) under the Central Government that have been converted as unreserved during the said period; and

(c) the steps taken to ensure that the scheduled castes/tribes people get their due share in all categories of Government Services?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b). The required statistics are not available. However, the available information for a period of five years from 1957 to 1961 and for a period of four years from 1960 to 1963 is available and is given below:—

Class	**Total number of vacancies reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes treated as unreserved*
	†1957—1961
I .	1,047
II .	2,113
III .	25,760
	†1960—1963
I .	686
II .	921
III .	15,773

*Figures separately for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes not available.

†Year-wise break-up not available.

(c) The steps taken are indicated in the statement laid in the Table of the House [*Placed in Library. See* No. L T. IV-246/67].

इटावा–भिन्ड टेलीफोन सेवा

590. **श्री यशवन्त सिंह कुशवाहा :** क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या इटावा (उत्तर प्रदेश) और भिन्ड (मध्य प्रदेश) के बीच सीधी टेलीफोन सेवा आरम्भ करके में लिये क्या कार्यवाही की गई है , और

(ख) भिन्ड से इटावा तक ट्रंक काल करने के लिये 1963 से लिये जा रहे शुल्क में कितनी वृद्धि हुई है ?

संसद्-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य मंत्री (श्री इन्द्रकुमार गुजराल) : (क) कोई नहीं ।

(ख) प्रति यूनिट 50 पैसे बढ़ा दिए गए हैं ।

भिन्ड–ग्वालियर टेलीफोन लाइन

591. **श्री यशवन्त सिंह कुशवाहा :** क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) 1 फरवरी से 28 फरवरी 1967 तक भिन्ड और ग्वालियर के बीच टेलीफोन लाइन कितनी बार खराब हुई ;

(ख) इतनी जल्दी-जल्दी लाइन खराब हो जाने के क्या कारण हैं ; और

(ग) इस टेलीफोन लाइन के इस प्रकार खराब हो जाने को रोकने तथा टेलीफोन सेवा को सुधारने के लिए क्या कदम उठाये गये है ?

संसद्-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री इन्द्रकुमार गुजराल) : (क) चौदह बार ।

(ख) गड़बड़ी मुख्य रूप से तांबे की तार की चोरी और लाइनों में हुई खराबी के कारण हुई ।

(ग) तांबे के तार की जगह ए० सी० एस० आर० वाहक लगाने की योजना बनाई गई है । राज्य के पुलिस अधिकारियों से यह प्रार्थना की गई है कि वे तेजी से कार्रवाई करें और तांबे के तारों की चोरी की घटनाएं कम से कम हों ।

ग्वालियर के टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज की इमारत

592. **श्री यशवन्त सिंह कुशवाहा :** क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या ग्वालियर में स्वचालित टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज की इमारत का निर्माण कार्य कब तक पूरा हो जाने की सम्भावना है; और

(ख) उस पर कितनी लागत आने का अनुमान है ?

संसद्-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री इन्द्रकुमार गुजराल) : (क) इमारत के 30 सितम्बर 1967 तक पूरा हो जाने की संभावना है ।

(ख) 17,02,600 रुपये ।

Cochin Dock Workers

593. **Shri C. Janardhanan:**
Shri Vasudevan Nair:
Shri P. C. Adichan:

Will the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Cochin Dock Workers have put forward certain demands before the authorities;

(b) if so whether any of these demands has been met; and

(c) if not the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) The Cotton Dock Labour Union, which is an unrecognised union, have raised certain demands.

(b) and (c). The matter is under consideration.

Shop Timings in Delhi

594. **Shri Madhu Limaye:** Will the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a representation was made by the representatives of Traders/Employers in Delhi to revise the timings of the opening and closing of shops/commercial establishments which were in force since the 25th October, 1961;

(b) whether the employees' associations were strongly opposed to the changes suggested by the employers;

(c) if so, the reason for changing the timings; and

(d) whether this change was introduced by the Delhi Administration on their own or in consultation with the Labour Advisory Board?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes.

(b) No; but there was some difference of opinion between the employers and employees representatives.

(c) The closing hour of 7.00 P.M. was not convenient to the public at large.

(d) In consultation with the Labour Advisory Board of Delhi Administration.

Sirmur Succession

595. **Shri C. C. Desai:** Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the present stage of the case for succession to the old ruler of Sirmur in Himachal Pradesh;

(b) whether he left an adopted son behind who has been recognised for normal inheritance;

(c) if so, the justification for not recognising the adopted son for the purpose of succession and Government notification; and

(d) whether it is proposed to lapse the State and if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) to (d). The late Ruler of Sirmur did not leave any male issue, or an adopted son, or a near male collateral. Some time after the Ruler's death one of the Maharanis adopted a son of her daughter. After considering all aspects of the matter, and the claim put forward on behalf of the Maharani's adopted son, the President has decided that no person should be recognised as successor to the late Maharaja

National Script for All Languages of India

596. **Shri Bedabrata Barua:** Will the Minister of **Education** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have under consideration a proposal to develop a national script for all the languages of India; and

(b) if so, the progress made in the matter so far?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Prof. Sher Singh): (a) and (b). No Sir. However, the Government have recently accepted the recommendations of an Expert Committee and this introduced diacritical marks in the Devanagari script to standardize it, so that other Indian Languages mentioned in the Constitution can also be appropriately written in this script.

Emoluments of Ministers

597. **Shri D. N. Patodia:**
Shri Solanki:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the total quantum of emoluments of a Cabinet Minister, Minister of State and a Deputy Minister after taking into account all the perquisites like subsidised housing, allowances, secretarial and other staff, transport, and all other facilities available to a Minister in discharge of his duties; and

(b) the total amount of emoluments that the Ministers will be left with after the allowances, perquisites and facilities stated in part (a) above are made subject to income-tax?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b). A statement containing the requisite information is placed on the Table of the House. [*Placed in the Library. See* No LT-247/67].

Properties acquired by the Central Government

598. **Shri Sarjoo Pandey:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the properties (i) Bazar Thakurganj, Lucknow and (ii) Groves of village Khirkaiya, Sitapur were

acquired by the Central Government after their partition by the Competent Officer in 1964;

(b) if not, how the Regional Authorities of U.P. disposed of these properties without their acquisition;

(c) whether the above authorities were competent to divide and sell them without the help of technical staff in the Department; and

(d) whether any financial loss has been incurred by Government as a result of the above transaction?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): (a) The properties were partitioned by the Competent Officer in April, 1963. Thereafter, they were acquired under the general notification issued under Section 12 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, issued in December, 1963

(b) Does not arise

(c) As the disposal of the properties did not involve any technical problem, help of technical officers was not necessary.

(d) The sales in the case of 23 purchases have since been finalised and the sale certificates issued in favour of the auction purchasers. In the case of remaining seven cases disputes have arisen and the sales have not yet been finalised.

The properties have been sold by open public auction and only the highest bids offered at the open auction were accepted. The question of loss, therefore, does not arise.

The groves are situated in village Kakramau, Saryan, district Sitapur and not in village Khirkaiya. The sales of these groves have since been cancelled.

Regional Engineering College Hostel and Mess Employees Union, Chathamangalam, Kerala

599. Shri A. Sridharan: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Central Government have received any representation from the Regional Engineering College Hostel and Mess Employees Union, Chathamangalam, Kerala, regarding the *en masse* retrenchment of mess employees; and

(b) if so, the action taken in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): (a) No, Sir. There has been no retrenchment of mess employees.

(b) Does not arise.

टेलीफोन कर्मचारी

600. श्री हरदयाल देवगुन : क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) देश भर में 60 वर्ष से अधिक आयु के कितने कर्मचारी दैनिक वेतन पर तारघरों में काम कर रहे है:

(ख) क्या यह सच है कि देश में अस्थायी तार बाबुओं की संख्या 600 से अधिक है और इनमें से 100 तार बाबुओं को, जिन्होंने दो वर्ष तक सेवा की है, सेवा समाप्ति के नोटिस मिल गये हैं; और

(ग) यदि हा, तो ऐसे नोटिस दिये जाने के क्या कारण हैं और क्या ये कारण उन नोटिसों में बताये गये हैं ?

संसद्-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री इन्द्रकुमार गुजराल) : (क) मार्च, 1967 के बीच लगभग 80 ।

(ख) अस्थायी तार-संकेतकों की संख्या लगभग 2850 है और दो वर्ष तक की नौकरी वाले उन अस्थायी तार-संकेतकों की संख्या जिन्हें "नियमानुसार काम करो" आन्दोलन के दौरान सेवा-समाप्ति के नोटिस दे दिये गये थे, लगभग 170 है ।

(ग) नोटिस केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (अस्थायी सेवा) नियमावली, 1965 के नियम 5 के अन्तर्गत असंतोषजनक आचरण के कारण दिये गये । इस नियम के अन्तर्गत नौकरी की समाप्ति के लिए कोई कारण बताना जरूरी नहीं है ।

Charges for Telephone Calls

601. Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the charges for a single local telephone call are different in Madras, Bombay and Calcutta;

(b) if so, the actual charges and the reasons for the difference;

(c) whether there is also a difference in the annual rental and free calls permitted in these cities; and

(d) if so, the steps taken to remove this disparity?

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri I. K. Gujral): (a) No The charges are 15 paise per call every-where.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The quarterly rental in the local area of Madras, Bombay, Calcutta and Delhi is Rs. 75, while it is Rs. 60 in other metered exchanges The number of free calls in the same everywhere.

(d) Th difference is justified by higher costs in the very large cities.

Representation of Minorities in Central Government Services

602. Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any complaints regarding the inadequate representation of minority communities (including Muslims from West Bengal) in Central Government Services; and

(b) if so, the steps taken to give adequate representation to such communities?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Yes, Sir. Representations have been received from time to time from members of various minority communities on this subject.

(b) The Constitution of India guarantees equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State and also provides that no citizen shall be ineligible for or discriminated against on grounds *inter alia* of religion. Reservations in appointments or posts are only permissible in favour of any backward class of citizens, which, in the opinion of the State, is not adequately represented in the services under the State, consistently with the maintenance of efficiency of administration These provisions of the Constitution do not permit of reservations in favour of members of minority communities as such It is hoped that with the improvement in educational facilities and spread of education, the minority communities will gradually secure better representation in the services under the Central Government on the basis of merit.

Telephone Billing in Calcutta

603 Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Will the Minister of **Communications** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Telephone billing in Calcutta is done by accounting machines;

(b) if so, the total number of employees who have been working in the Billing Department during the last 3 years;

(c) the number of complaints received regarding the incorrect billing

from the subscribers since 1964-65; and

(d) the steps taken in this regard?

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri I. K. Gujral): (a) A major portion of the work is done on the accounting machines through the Service Bureau of Messrs IMB World Trade Corporation, on contract basis.

(b) Total number of employees (including class IV) for the residual billing and accounting work done manually is 353.

(c) The exact number of complaints received during 1964-65 is not readily available. 10541 complaints were received during 1965-66.

(d) Steps had been taken to ensure accuracy in issue of bills

मध्य प्रदेश में टेलीफोन लाइनें लगाना

604. **श्री शशि भूषण :** क्या संचार मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) खंडवा से खरगोन (मध्य प्रदेश) तक टेलीफोन लाइन लगाने का कार्य, जो टेलीफोन की तांबे की तार की कमी होने के कारण स्थगित कर दिया गया था, कब तक पूरा किया जायेगा; और

(ख) मध्य प्रदेश के पश्चिम विमान जिले में खरगोन से कासरवाद होते हुए सिन्धुआ तक टेलीफोन लाइन लगाने के लिये क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ?

संसद-कार्य विभाग तथा संचार विभाग में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री इन्द्रकुमार गुजराल) : (क) 150 पौंड प्रति मील के तांबे के तार की, जो कि आयात किया जाने वाला सामान है, आम कमी है और इसे प्राप्त करने के लिए आवश्यक विदेशी मुद्रा अभी तक नहीं मिली है । बड़ी गेज के निकाले गये तांबे के तार को इस्तेमाल करने के प्रश्न पर, जो कि इस समय उपलब्ध हैं, विचार किया जा रहा है ताकि यह काम चालू वित्तीय वर्ष में पूरा किया जा सके ।

(ख) खरगोन सीधी ट्रंक लाइन द्वारा सिन्धुआ (सेधवा) होकर इन्दौर से पहले ही जुड़ा है । कासरवात से उसे धानमोद से जोडकर, जो कि निकटतम एक्सचेंज है और सामान्य ट्रंक लाइनों पर है, एक दूरस्थ सार्वजनिक टेलीफोन घर खोला जा रहा है । फिर भी कासरवात होकर खरगोन से सिन्धुआ तक लाइन लगाने का कोई प्रस्ताव नही है, किन्तु खरगोन से सिन्धुआ तक सीधा मार्ग बनाने का प्रस्ताव है ।

दिल्ली में अवैतनिक मैजिस्ट्रेट

605. **श्री हरदयाल देवगुण :** क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) दिल्ली मे कितने अवैतनिक मैजिस्ट्रेट है तथा उनकी नियुक्ति के लिये क्या अर्हतायें तथा शर्तें निर्धारित की गई हैं;

(ख) क्या सरकार को पता है कि इन मे से कुछ मैजिस्ट्रेट इन अर्हताओं और शर्तों को पूरा नही करते; और

(ग) क्या इस के बारे में जनता के कड़े विरोध को ध्यान मे रखते हुए सरकार का विचार अवैतनिक मैजिस्ट्रेटो के पदो को समाप्त करने का है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) 1-4-67 को अवैतनिक मैजिस्ट्रेटो की संख्या 39 थी ।

अवैतनिक मैजिस्ट्रेटों की नियुक्ति के लिये अर्हताओं और शर्तों को बताने वाला एक विवरण सभा पटल पर रखा है । [पुस्तकालय में रखा गया । देखिये संख्या एल० टी० 251/67]

(ख) सब-मजिस्ट्रेट आवश्यक अर्हताओं को पूरा करते हैं ।

(ग) इन पदों के विरुद्ध कोई शिकायत सरकार को प्राप्त नहीं हुई है। इन पदों को समाप्त करने का कोई प्रस्ताव सरकार के पास विचाराधीन नहीं है।

Salary of Police Cadres in Delhi

606. **Shri Bal Raj Madhok:** Will the **Minister of Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Police cadres serving in Delhi bad a parity of salary with cadres in the Revenue Department till 1947;

(b) whether it is also a fact that parity no longer exists and that the salaries of grades of Police cadres are now much lower than those enjoyed by their counterparts in the Revenue Department; and

(c) if so, the reasons therefor and whether Government contemplate taking any action to remove this disparity?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

Grievances of Shore Labour

607. **Shri Indrajit Gupta:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a Commission of Inquiry was set up on 18-3-66 to go into the grievances of "B" Category Shore Labour under the various Port Trusts;

(b) whether the Commission has submitted its findings and recommendations; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefore despite the 6 months' time-limit specified under the Industrial Disputes Act?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) The Commission of Inquiry was set up on 19-3-1966.

(b) No.

(c) Section 14 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 requires the Court to report to the Government ordinarily within six months from the commencement of the Inquiry. Due to pressure of other adjudication work in hand the Court has not been able to submit its findings. It is expected to complete the work by the end of May 1967.

Job Security for Employees of Oil Companies

608. **Shri Indrajit Gupta:** Will the Minister of **Labour and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the job security of the Indian employees of foreign oil companies in India continues to be threatened by such anti-labour measures as enforced retirement, introduction of automatic computers and the closure of establishments; and

(b) whether Government propose to take any further measures to safeguard job security, especially in view of the huge profits earned by these companies?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). Issues relating to job security in foreign oil companies in India are proposed to be discussed at a tripartite meeting on April 28, 1967.

Kidnapping of a Girl in Delhi

609 **Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta:**
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Narayan Swaroop Sharma:
Shri P. K. Deo:
Shri Baburao Patel:

Will the Minister of **Home Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that one college student, Miss Kanta Vohra was kidnapped on the 7th March, while going to the Women's Polytechnic College, Kashmere Gate, Delhi;

(b) whether the guardian of the girl made a complaint at the Jama

Masjid Police Station on the same day but no action was taken by the Police Station authorities;

(c) wheher it is also a fact that she has not been traced so far;

(d) whether it is also a fact that 4 children of Delhi Cantonment area were kidnapped nearly 2 years ago but the Police has not been able to trace them so far; and

(e) the steps Government propose to take to stop such incidents?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b). A complaint was lodged at the Jama Masjid Police Station on 8-3-1967 by a resident of Turkman Gate stating that his daughter had been kidnapped. She has been missing since 7-3-1967 A case under Section 363 I.P.C. was registered at the Police Station and immediate investigation was taken up

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) The Delhi Police are on the alert for any clues to the recovery of the 4 missing children of Delhi Cantonment.

(e) The Delhi Police have taken special steps to keep the activities of anti-social elements under effective check.

धनबाद कोयला खानों में दुर्घटनायें

610. **श्री राम सिंह :**
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :

क्या श्रम तथा पुनर्वास मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) क्या यह सच है कि वर्ष 1966 तथा 1967 मे धनबाद की कोयला खानों में अनेक दुर्घटनाएं हुई, जिनके परिणामस्वरूप अनेक व्यक्तियों की मृत्यु हो गई;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इससे जान और माल का कितना नुकसान हुआ; और

(ग) सरकार ने कितने कर्मचारियों को सहायता दी है और इस प्रकार कितनी राशि की सहायता दी गई है ?

श्रम तथा पुनर्वास मंत्री (श्री हाथी) : (क), (ख) और (ग). धनबाद जिला की कोयला खानों में 1966 के दौरान और 1967 की पहली तिमाही के दौरान हुई घातक दुर्घटनाओं की संख्या क्रमश 65 और 16 थी । इन दुर्घटनाओं में मरे व्यक्तियों की संख्या 1966 के दौरान 77 और 1967 की पहली तिमाही के दौरान 25 थी । 1967 के आकडे कच्चे है । सम्पत्ति की हानि तथा प्रश्न के भाग (ग) के सम्बन्ध मे सूचना एकत्र की जा रही है और सदन की मेज पर रख दी जायगी ।

गोवा में एक कोयला खान में दुर्घटना

611. **श्री राम सिंह :**
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) क्या यह सच है कि गोआ में सुगवान तालुक में बटदाना गाव में हुई एक दुर्घटना मे 11 व्यक्ति मारे गये और तीन अन्य व्यक्तियो को चोटें आई;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस दुर्घटना के क्या कारण थे, और

(ग) मृत-व्यक्तियो के परिवारों के लोगों को सरकार ने कितनी सहायता दी है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) : 23-3-67 को बरजाना ग्राम में एक विस्फोटकागार में नौ व्यक्ति मारे गये और ६ को मामूली चोटें आई ।

(ख) यह घटना उस समय हुई जब विस्फोटकागार, जिसमें सुरंगें लगाने के लिए प्रयोग में लाये जाने वाले विस्फोटक रख

थे, खुला था और उसमें सफाई की जा रही थी । कारण अभी तक पता नहीं चला । जांच का आदेश दे दिया गया है ।

(ग) मृत तथा आहत व्यक्तियों के परिवारों को क्षति पूर्ति के रूप में 2150 रुपये की राशि दी गई ।

नागाओं द्वारा करों की वसूली

612. **श्री राज सिंह :**
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :

क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि विद्रोही नागा लोग असाम में शिव सागर जिले के तिनबाड़ सब-डिवीजन के गांवों में 10 रुपये प्रति परिवार के हिसाब से जबरदस्ती कर वसूल कर रहे हैं;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि वे ढोरों को उठा ले जाते हैं और उन्हें तब वापिस करते हैं जब उन्हें कर की राशि दे दी जाती है; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो इस मामले में केन्द्रीय सरकार तथा राज्य सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) : (क) से (ग), असाम नागालैंड सीमा पर जबर्दस्ती धन एकत्रित करने के कुछ मामलों के बारे में सूचना मिली है। राज्य सरकार से ब्यौरा मंगाया जा रहा है और यथा समय सदन के सभा-पटल पर रख दिया जायेगा ।

Kidnapping of Young Girls in Delhi

613. **Shri Baburao Patel:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of young girls that have been reported missing or kidnapped from Delhi since January, 1967;

(b) the action taken by Government to recover these missing girls; and

(c) the measures taken by Government to prevent such kidnappings in future?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) and (b). During the months of January, February and March (upto 25-3-67)) 54 girls and women were reported to have been kidnapped or abducted. 41 of them have already been recovered. The Delhi Police are making vigorous efforts to trace the remaining missing persons.

(c) The Delhi Police have taken special steps to keep the activities of anti-social and criminal elements under effective check.

Arrests under D.I.R./Preventive Detention Act during Indo-Pak Conflict in 1965

614. **Shri George Fernandes:**
Shri J. H. Patel:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Indian citizens detained for security reasons or on any other count under the Defence of India Rules and/or the Preventive Detention Act during the hostilities between India and Pakistan in the months of August, September and October, 1965; and

(b) how many of them are still under detention?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Status of Urdu

615. **Shri George Fernandes:**
Shri J. H. Patel:

Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received representations from some

organisations to give Urdu language its rightful place in the country;

(b) the nature of these representations; and

(c) the steps taken in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-248/67].

Indian Students studying Abroad

616. Shri George Fernandes:
Shri J. H. Patel:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Indian students studying abroad, country-wise;

(b) whether any complaints have been received from the Indian students studying in the United Kingdom; and if so, the grievances listed by them; and

(c) the action taken on those complaints?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Prof. Sher Singh): (a) According to the latest available information, the total number of Indian Students studying abroad, countrywise, is given in the Annexure. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-248/67]

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

Indian Smugglers killed in Encounters

617. Shri Suraj Bhan: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the number of the Indian smugglers killed in encounters with the Indian border authorities upto the middle of August, 1965 i.e., before the Indo-Pak conflict;

(b) the quantity and nature of the ammunition recovered from the smugglers; and

(c) whether the ammunition thus recovered was licensed one?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) to (c) (a) Nine.

(b) (i) Revolvers	..	6
(ii) Pistols	..	2
(iii) Cartridges—		
(a) live	..	79
(b) Empty	..	3
(c) Missed	..	1

(c) The arms and ammunition recovered were not licensed.

(The above figures cover the period of five years before August 1965 and exclude J and K from where information is awaited.)

Teachers of Remedial Classes held by Central Board of Higher Secondary Education, Delhi

618. Shri R. Barua: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 2463 on the 17th August, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the remedial classes were also held in the subject of English for the students placed in compartment by the Central Board of Higher Secondary Education, Delhi in 1965 summer vacation from 15th June, 1965;

(b) whether trained Graduate teachers detailed to teach these students have not been given pecuniary benefits at par with the teachers of other subjects; and

(c) if so, the reasons for the non-payment of the remuneration to the English teachers?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad):

(a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Does not arise.

Financial Crisis in D.M.C.

619. **Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Delhi Municipal Corporation has sent any representation to Government for subsidy or loan;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Delhi Municipal Corporation is in financial crisis; and

(c) the action taken by Government to remove this difficulty of the Corporation?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) The Delhi Municipal Corporation has been approaching the Government from time to time for grants-in-aid and special loans.

(b) The Corporation has been experiencing financial difficulties for some time past.

(c) Government have been advancing loans and giving grants to the Corporation on a determined pattern from time to time. A Commission of Inquiry has been appointed by Government to enquire into the financial resources and requirements of local bodies in Delhi. Its reports is awaited.

प्रशासनिक सुधार आयोग

620. **श्री शशि भूषण :** क्या गृह-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) प्रशासनिक सुधार आयोग पर अब तक कितनी धनराशि व्यय की गई है;

(ख) इसके कार्य पर कितने कर्मचारी नियुक्त किये गये हैं और उसमें नये व्यक्ति कितने हैं; और

(ग) मंत्री मंडल में श्री मुरारजी देसाई के शामिल हो जाने तथा श्री हनुमंतय्या के चेयरमैन के रूप में नियुक्त हो जाने से इस आयोग में रिक्त हो गये पद परकब तक नियुक्ति हो जाने की संभावना

गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) (क) 1965–66 तथा 1966–67 में 22 फरवरी, 1967 तक 16,33,611 रुपया व्यय हुआ ।

(ख) आयोग के सब वर्गों के कर्मचारियों की संख्या 169 है । उनमें से 68 अस्थायी रूप से नियुक्त किये गए नये कर्मचारी थे ।

(ग) आयोग में और कोई नये सदस्य नियुक्त नहीं किये जा रहे है ।

Compensatory Allowance to Employees of Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration.

620-A. **Shri K. E. Ganesh:** Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the employees of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands Administration have demanded increase in the rate of compensatory allowance;

(b) whether the Chief Commissioner's Advisory Council has recommended such an increase;

(c) if so, the reaction of the Central Government thereto;

(d) whether it is also a fact that non-permanent industrial staff is not in receipt of this compensatory allowance; and

(e) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla):

(a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

(c) This demand has been carefully considered by Government and they have not found it possible to agree to it.

(d) and (e). All employees drawing regular scales of pay are allowed the compensatory allowance.

Awards for U.S. Seminar on Students' Services

628-B. Shri Jyotirmoy Basu:
Shri Umanath:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether the award and grants to ten educationists to attend U.S. seminar on students' services have been made through Government;

(b) the actual role which the recipients for the award are going to play during the two-month seminar; and

(c) whether Government are fully satisfied that the C.I.A. has no hand in the matter?

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): (a) No. Sir. The ten educationists have been selected by the U.S Educational Foundation in India on the basis of nominations made by the Vice-Chancellors of different universities.

(b) The selected persons will observe students services programmes at the Earham College (Indiana) and have an intensive programme at Bloomington University, rounded off by a brief evaluation programme in Washington.

(c) Government have no information about C.I.A. having a hand in the matter.

जीव-विज्ञान तथा प्रयोगात्मक औषधि संस्था, कलकत्ता

628-C. श्री रबी राय :
श्री मधु लिमये :

क्या शिक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि सरकार ने जीव विज्ञान तथा प्रयोगात्मक औषधि संस्था, कलकत्ता के हिसाब किताब की जांच करने का कार्य विशेष पुलिस संस्था को सौंपा था ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो यह जांच करवाने का क्या उद्देश्य था और उसका क्या परिणाम रहा ?

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री भागवत झा आजाद) : (क) जी नहीं ।

(ख) प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

Khadi Gramodyog Bhawan, Madras

628-D Shri Indrajit Gupta: Will the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation be pleased to state.

(a) whether the Khadi Gramodyog Bhawan under the Khadi and Village Industries Board at Madras, has applied for exemption from the provisions of the Payment of Bonus Act as well as the Industrial Disputes Act; and

(b) if so, whether the exemption has been granted by Government?

The Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation (Shri Hathi): (a) An application has been received from the Khadi and Village Industries Commission for exemption from the provisions of the Payment of Bonus Act and not from the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act.

(b) The matter lies in the State sphere and it is for the Madras Government to consider whether the exemption should be granted or not.

12.05 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

India's Participation in Secret Seminar on Asian Defence held in New Delhi recently with several NATO and SEATO Member States

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): I call the attention of the Minister of External Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

> "India's participation in secret seminar on Asian Defence held in New Delhi recently with several NATO and SEATO member States."

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): A Seminar was held from the 31st March 1967 to 2nd April, 1967, under the joint auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs and the Institute for Strategic Studies (London), on the problems of Asian Security. The Seminar sought to provide an opportunity for the exchange of views between a group of foreign scholars. Who have made detailed study of the related problems, and persons with similar field of specialisation in India. There were 18 foreign and an equal number of Indian participants. The foreign participants consisted of well-known experts from U.K., U.S.A., France, Germany, Sweden, Japan, Australia, Canada and Singapore. The Seminar was private and, by agreement between the two sponsoring organisations, the deliberations were not publicised. The participants, both Indian and foreign, were invited to take part in their individual capacity and it was not the purpose of the Seminar to make any recommendations or forge any consensus from the discussions.

The Institute for Strategic Studies in a non-official body of International standing and makes compilation of the studies on defence problems of various countries. These studies have come to be respected all over the world for their factual accuracy. Indeed, they have been quoted by the hon Members on the Floor of this House on many occasions. The Institute has also had similar discussions with representatives of many other countries, including the Soviet Union and the socialist countries of Europe.

The Government of India firmly believe in a free and frank exchange of views among scholars and political scientists of different countries which seminars of the kind referred to seek to promote. We hope to have similar exchanges with other groups of countries. The participation of Indian scholars and Government officials in the current Seminar, or similar ones in the future, does not mean any change in our policies, nor the discussions therein amount to an exercise in mutual conversion.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: It is a very serious matter. May I know whether it is not a fact, firstly, that this Institute of Strategic Studies located in London was formerly a part of the British War Office and is now jointly run by U.S and U.K., partners in NATO, and secondly, whether it is not a fact that the Indian Institute of World Affairs which receives financial assistance from the Government of India, last year sent some representative—I do not know, whom—to London in order to prepare for this Seminar in collaboration with them, and why a secret confabulation of this type concerning Defence matters is held on our soil with the participation of such people as Air Vice Marshal P. C. Lal the Head of our Automatic Establishment, Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, Gen. Som Dutt and such other important people connected with Defence matters and why everything is kept secret and husband up like this when countries belonging to NATO and SEATO are participating in it?

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is not correct to use the word 'secret'. Let us use the correct English expression 'private'. There is a world of difference between 'secret' and 'private'.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: That means we do not know what goes on there.

Shri M. C. Chagla: It was not intended to publicise the discussion there nor was it intended to admit the press or the public.

With regard to this particular body, namely, the Institute of Strategic Studies, I would submit that it is a non-official body of a very high standing. The whole purpose of this seminar as I have said, was to exchange views and ideas, and to understand each other's point of view. I think that it is of very great importance that we in India should know what the people who came here thought about defence problems and they should know what our views were also. I might point our that this was not restricted to what my hon. friend says, namely members of the SEATO and the NATO. All of them are not members of the SEATO or the NATO. For instance, Sweden was there....

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Let him read out the names of the countries which participated in it.

Shri M. C Chagla: I shall read out the names presently

But it is also proposed to have a similar seminar with non-aligned and socialist countries. I think that it is a good thing for India to know what thinking is about Asian defence in different parts of the world For instance, Sweden was there Sweden belongs neither to the SEATO nor to NATO. Then, Singapore was there. I have given two instances. The names of the countries were: the United Kingdom, the United States of America, France, Germany, Japan, Australia, Canada, Singapore etc. This is one type of conference. We shall have other types of conferences also. We do not want to keep it confined to this; we shall have seminars with other countries also, and we want their views also. This is merely exchange of views. What is the meaning of a seminar except that you sit down and discuss?

Dr. Ranen Sen (Barasat): Just now, the hon. Minister has said that it was a sort of private seminar organised by the Institute of Strategic Studies. He has read out the names of the countries that participated in that seminar. In view of the fact that so far the Government of India have advocated non-alignment in their foreign policy and in regard to defence also this is very important, may I know how the Government of India are not only sending their accredited representatives but also sending private individuals to such organisations as the Institute of Strategic Studies and to this seminar without the sanction of this House which has decided on the foreign policy of non-alignment to be pursued by the Government of India?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I made it quite clear in my statement and I emphatically repeat that there is no change in our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence This seminar was not intended to discuss questions of policy. It is also wrong to say that this seminar was convened by the Institute of Strategic Studies As I have said, it was held under the joint auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs which is an Indian body, and the Institute of Strategic Studies, London.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): Only the other day, on the 3rd of April, the hon. Minister told the House that the British Government had proposed to buy certain islands in the Indian Ocean and our Government were examining the implications to India of the British intention to purchase those islands.

Now we hear about the Institute of Strategic Studies, whose antecedents should be known to the Minister in spite of the innocence which he wears. We have this kind of thing going on. How in this case does Government expect that the world outside would not think, as it already has begun to think with good reason, that we have jumped, or as good as jumped, already into the neo-imperialist bandwagon?

Shri M. C. Chagla: My hon. friend will be satisfied that we have not jumped into anybody's bandwagon when he listens to the statement that I am going to make on the purchase of Indian Ocean Islands by the UK tomorrow or the day after.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Janardhanan.

Shri Ranjeet Singh (Khalilabad): It is presumed that no secrets . . .

Mr. Speaker: I am calling only those whose names are here.

Shri Ranjeet Singh: I have been rising several times.

Mr. Speaker: Even if he goes on rising for one hour, he cannot be called unfortunately because he has not given notice.

An hon. Member: This is a short notice question . . .

Mr. Speaker: He seems to be half an hour behind. We have passed it already.

Shri M. Meghchandra (Inner Manipur): The hon. Minister has already stated that there has been such a conference. In view of the fact that India is anti-imperialist in her outlook and takes a neutral position in the Vietnam conflict, may I know whether such partipation in such a conference will embarrass our position and get us entangled in the game of the neo-colonialists and their designs? If so, why this participation in the name of defence?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I may repeat again that this seminar does not in the slightest degree affect our foreign policy or our views about neo-colonialism or our views on the war that is going on in Vietnam. This conference has nothing whatever to do with these questions. Our policy remains as stated in this House from time to time.

श्री तसाक्कत अली खां (मुजफ्फरनगर) : क्या गवर्नमेंट यह यकीन दिलायेगी कि इस सैमिनार में कोई फौजी राज दूसरे मुल्कों को को नहीं बतलाया गया है ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I am in a position to give the assurance to the House that no military secrets or any other secrets were let out at this meeting.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Was he there? It was a closed-door meeting. How did he know?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I know the Indians who were representing us in this conference. I have every confidence in them. I know that no secret was leaked out or even thought of leaking out.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Peermade): At least from the Indian side we are told that top officials of the Defence Ministry as well as the Atomic Energy Department participated in this so-called non-official seminar. Who were the participants from the other countries, especially the USA and UK, whether they were top officials connected with the defence departments of these two countries? If so, whether some of the facts concerning the defence and military position in the participating countries were placed before the seminar in the presence of the officials of these countries?

Shri M. C. Chagla: Yes, the people who represented the different countries were very important people, and if the House wants to know, I can

[M. C. Chagla]

give the list. Australia was represented by Prof. J. D. B. Miller, Dept. of International Relations, Australian National University, Canberra; Canada was represented by Dr. A. K. Longair, Director, Directorate of Atomic Research, Defence Research Board, Ottawa; France was represented by M. Andre Fontaine, Foreign editor, *Le Monde* of Paris, one of the most influential paper in France, perhaps in Europe, Germany was represented by Dr. Theo Sommer, Foreign Editor, Die Seit, Hamburk. That also is a very influential paper Japan was represented by Prof H. Kotani, International Peace Research Institute, Tokyo and Prof. Kei Wakaizumi, Professor of International Relations, Kyoto University Sweden was represented by Dr Karl Birnbaum, Director of the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm. Britain was represented by Mr. Hedley Hull, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Research Unit of the Foreign Office, Mr Leonard Beaton, Consultant to the Institute for Strategic Studies, and Mr. Robert Wade-Gery, Fellow, All Souls College, Oxford.

The United States, in which my hon. friend is particularly interested, was represented by Prof. Roger Hilsman of the Institute of War and Peace Studies, Columbia University, New York, Prof. Chalmers Johnson, University of California, Berkley, Mr. Arnold Kramish, Senior Staff Member, Physics Department, Rand Corporat on, Mr. Charles Bolte, Vice-President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, and Prof. Albert Wohlstetter, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago. Mr Arnold Kramish is at the moment Research Associate of the Institute for Strategic Studies.

Singapore was represented by Prof. Ching Hai Ding and Mr. Alistar Buchan the Director of the I.S.S.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): When the Short Notice Question was taken up by you, you only stuck to the names that were in the list.

Mr. Speaker: A number of others were also called.

Shri Sonavane: My point of order relates to the Short Notice Question.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, you are making a wrong statement I called a dozen people.

Shri Sonavane: Please give me a patient hearing.

Mr. Speaker: You had to raise it then, *not* now.

Shri Sonavane: When I rose on my feet I caught your eye, but you did not call me. I want to raise a point of order in that behalf. Can I not raise a point of order in respect of that? Because you passed on to the call attention notice and I was not given a chance to raise the point of order at that time, I am raising the point of order now.

Mr. Speaker: He forgot and he raises it now. I have not permitted

---

12.23 hrs.

MOTION OF PRIVILEGE RE. MRS. SVETLANA ALLELEUVA AFFAIR

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of a question of privilege from Dr. Lohia and Shri Madhu Limaye, in which they allege that in the light of a letter dated 23rd March, 1967 which Dr. Lohia is said to have received from Mrs. Svetlana, the Ministers of External Affairs and Commerce and the Prime Minister have misled the House by making allegedly untruthful statements in this House on the Svetlana affair.

I now ask Dr. Lohia to ask for the leave of the House to raise this question of privilege.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदन की इजाजत मांगने के पहले कुछ थोड़ी बातें बतला देना चाहता हूं अगर आप इजाजत दें। ...व्यवधान

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : यह नियम है। यह लोग क्यों हल्ला कर रहे हैं ? अध्यक्ष महोदय ने इजाजत दी है।

श्री वैजनाथ कुरील (रामसनेहीघाट) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था सम्बन्धी प्रश्न है।

Mr. Speaker: Under what rule?

श्री वैजनाथ कुरील : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह हाउस बड़ा इम्पार्टेन्ट वर्क करने के लिये इकट्ठा हुआ है।

श्री मधु लिमये : तब क्या डा० लोहिया ने बुरा किया है ?

श्री वैजनाथ कुरील : किसानों के नुकसान का पैसा और टैक्सपेयर का पैसा यहां एक मिनट में हजारों की संख्या में खर्च होता है। माननीय सदस्य जिनके लिये फोकोडाइल टियर्स बहाते हैं उन का पैसा यहां पर वह इस तरह से खर्च करते हैं और प्राइवेट चिट्ठियों को यहां पर लाकर हाउस का समय बरबाद करते हैं।

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji (Howrah): On a point of order under rule 224(3). Unless the matter requires the intervention of this House, Dr. Lohia cannot bring this privilege motion.

Mr. Speaker: What is this? I have permitted him, and you are questioning that. It has come before the House after permission has been given.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: I can make a submission on this point for your kind consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Under which rule?

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: 224. I want to draw your attention to the fact that this matter does not really require the intervention of this House.

Mr. Speaker: I have permitted him. Dr. Lohia may continue.

The Minister of Law (Shri Govinda Menon): Sir, I suppose it is your intention to ask the House whether there has been a breach of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: That is right.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप प्रक्रिया को ठीक तरह समझ लीजिये। उन्होंने इजाजत दी है। लोग बीच में क्यों बोल रहे हैं ? अध्यक्ष महोदय ने निर्णय दिया है। उनको बोलने का अधिकार है।

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Why should he speak now.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस सदन के लिये कर्नल करना जितना बड़ा अपराध है उससे बड़ा अपराध है उसके बारे में झूठ बोलना, और जब साबित हो जाये कि किसी मंत्री या किन्ही मंत्रियों ने इस सदन को जान बूझकर असत्य बोल कर गुमराह किया है तब केवल एक ही तरीका रह जाता है कि वह इस्तीफा दें। इस लिये पहली मांग मैं आप से यह करना चाहता हूं कि आप मुझे श्री चागला के 31 मार्च के बयान को यहां फिर से पढ़ने दें, जिस मे उन्होंने कहा है कि: "दिनेश सिंह जी को न उन के मंत्री की हैसियत से न उन के निजी हैसियत से किसी भी तरह से स्वेतलाना से, न लिख कर न बोल कर यह कहा कि वह हिन्दुस्तान में रहना चाहती हैं। और सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं किसी भी सरकार के मंत्री को यह नहीं कहा गया, "आखिर में उन्होंने जोड़ा है :

"This is a categorical statement that I am making to this House."

"यह एक बिल्कुल ठोस बयान है जो मैं सदन में दे रहा हूं

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Lohia may kindly resume his seat. Will he tell me one thing? After it is admitted again he will have to argue the case. Why should he do it twice? He may ask the leave of the House.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जैसा आप कहें । मैं सदन से इजाजत मांगता हूं ।

Shri R. D. Bhandare (Bombay Central): Sir, on a point of order. I am referring to the privilege motion which is sought to be moved by Dr. Lohia. The hon. Member Dr. Lohia said that because of the incorrect statements made by the hon. Minister he thought there was a breach of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: You are arguing the case. What is the point of order?

Shri R. D. Bhandare: The point of order is that the hon. Member has no right to raise the question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may kindly resume his seat and read rules 222, 225 and 226.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kandrapara): If there is no objection, there will be no need to refer it to the House.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: Sir, I have a point of order. I would request you to kindly read Speaker's Direction No. 115. Certain specific procedure had been laid down about incorrect statements there. I draw your kind attention to Direction No. 115. I have not got the book at hand; otherwise, I would have read it.

Mr. Speaker: It does not come in. The Law Minister.

Shri Govinda Menon: I am glad that Dr. Lohia, the author of the motion, explained what it is that he has to submit to the House.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अभी किया कहा है । मुझ को करने नहीं दिया गया है। ये क्या कह रहे हैं ?

Mr. Speaker: If there is no objection—(*Interruption*)—Just a minute. If permission is granted, later on, we will put it to the vote; not now. Permission has to be sought. Then we will put it to the vote whether it should go to the Committee of Privileges or not. Is there any objection to the motion being made? I will have to take the leave of the House.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Only 25 are necessary, I believe—Now, leave is granted. The hon. Member can move his motion now.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Before the hon. Member moves his motion, may I request you, instead of proceeding further under rule 226 which involves a motion and a debate in this House, to be good enough under rule 227 to exercise your right to refer this question without debate to the Committee of Privileges for examination, investigation or report? I do not think it is necessary for me to explain why I make this proposal. A debate in this House at this stage would be most unsuitable. Charges are difficult to prove or disprove in a big body like this. The Committee of Privileges is precisely constituted to go closely into matters of evidence, to hear the people concerned and to give a report to the House. I would therefore request you not to call on Dr. Lohia but to exercise your right under rule 227 to refer, without debate, to the Committee of Privileges, as a *prima facie* case has been made out.

Mr. Speaker: There are two statements. I do not want to say anything when one is pitted against the other. I do not want to take any sides. I would leave it to the House which will have to take a decision as

to which one is correct and which is wrong. One cannot force me to a particular course. (*Interruption*).

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Sir, you are following a novel procedure. There is a procedure followed in such cases.

Mr. Speaker: It is not novel. I am strictly following the rules. You may not agree with me. Dr. Lohia, you may move it.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterjee: Are you allowing them to discuss the merit of the privilege motion as such? (*Interruption*).

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): I support the suggestion that my hon. friend Shri Masani has made. This debate, if allowed now, will become very acrimonious and it will take a long time, and other useful business of the House will be delayed.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever it may be, you are making the same suggestion. But I cannot take the responsibility. If the House chooses, why should I take the responsibility on myself? I am not prepared to take the responsibility.

Shri P. K. Deo: You should keep the dignity of the Chair, Sir. The interests of the minority are also there. In a case like this, it is always the practice in this House that such matters are referred to the Committee of Privileges for a fuller examination. In a big House like this, it may not be possible. (*Interruption*). I beg to submit that you may kindly reconsider it and refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges as is being done in almost every case.

Shri Sheo Narain (Basti): Sir, a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Mr. Masani has made a request to you that under rules 226 to 227, you may, without permitting a discussion here, in the House, refer the matter to the Committee of privileges. What I want to urge is this. Dr. Lohia has also given notice of a motion. The motion is of the same nature, that after discussion it should be referred to the Committee of Privileges. The only difference is, after all, the Committee of Privileges will go into the entire matter if the House so decides and then, when the Committee of Privileges report comes before the House, the House may also have an opportunity to discuss it. Therefore, it will be better if we do not have a discussion at this stage (*Interruption*); let this matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges and the House will have an opportunity to discuss it again. That is my request to you, since the motion is the same, "that it be referred to the Committee of Privileges." Not that Dr. Lohia wants any decision here and now. He will move his motion for reference to the Privileges Committee. I request that underrule 227, you may please refer it to the Privileges Committee without any discussion at this stage.

Some hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: I have already given my decision and asked Dr. Lohia to speak I am not going to take the responsibility in this matter.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैंने अभी चागला साहब के 31 मार्च के बयान का तर्जुमा बताया था । मुझे यह सदन माफ करेगा अगर मैं . . . . .

Mr. Speaker: He may move his motion.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरा प्रस्ताव है कि इस सदन की राय है कि प्राइमा फेसाई देखते ही प्रधान मंत्री, विदेश मंत्री और व्यापार मंत्री के बयानों में असंगति और असत्य है, इसलिये यह प्रस्ताव विशेषाधिकार समिति को सौंप दिया जावे ।

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

ये जो तीन मंत्री हैं इनके खिलाफ यह विशेषाधिकार का प्रस्ताव है। मैंने आप से इसकी इजाजत चाही है। मैं आप से माफी मांग लेता हूं क्योंकि सब कारवाई अंग्रेजी में हुई है, इसलिए अंग्रेजी में ही मैं उद्धरण सुनाये देता हूं। सब से पहले तो 31 मार्च को जो श्री चागला ने कहा था उसको मैं दोहराये देता हूं। 31 मार्च को उन्होंने कहा था :

"I have the authority to state to this House categorically that at no time, either orally or in writing, did she make a request to him either in his capacity as Minister of State for External Affairs, or in his personal capacity as a relation of hers . . "

उसी के साथ साथ एक बार और जो कुछ कहा है वह भी सुनाये देता हूं। 21 मार्च को भी उन्होंने यह बात कही थी। उन्होंने कहा था :

"Leave aside a pathetic request but even an ordinary request was not made."

"It is absolutely incorrect to say that this lady made any request to the External Affairs Ministry, to any Minister or to the Prime Minister, to stay on in this country. I have said it before . . . ."

बहुत वक्त लगेगा इसलिये बाकी छोड़े देता हूं। यह उनका बार बार बयान हुआ है। मेरे पास जो खत आया है उस में से मैं-आली दो पैरे पढ़कर सुनाये देता हूं। एक तो यह है...

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। इस पत्र को बाद में आप टेबल पर रखने की इजाजत दें।

एक माननीय सदस्य : असली पत्र रखा जाए।

श्री शिव चन्द्रराव : क्या प्रमाण है कि यह स्वेतलाना का लिखा हुआ पत्र है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डा० लोहिया अपना भाषण जारी रखें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उन्होंने अपने पत्र में लिखा है कि दो बार बात हुई है। वैसे तो कई दफा हुई होगी। लेकिन स्वेतलाना के अनुसार जो खत उन्होंने लिखा है, दो बार बात हुई है।

उन्होंने अपने पत्र में लिखा है .

"Yes, there was a private talk between me and Dinesh Singh in January, in Kalakankar, about the possibility for me to stay in India the rest of my life. I've asked him whether it will be possible for me to approach the Prime Minister with such a request. Dinesh knew my feelings to my late husband, to Kalakankar, to India. It was no surprise for him that I wished to stay in India.

But he told me that he thinks it would be impossible to settle, because of the strongest opposition from the Soviet Government, which would inevitably arise"

एक बार दुबारा फिर जैसा उन्होंने लिखा वैसा मैं पढ़ रहा हूं :

"On the end of January, before Dinesh Singh left Kalakankar for Delhi, he talked with me again, to make quite clear to me, that Indian Government, the Prime Minister, and he himself would not be able anyhow to help me".

". if I decided not to return to Moscow and stay in India. He said that I should try to find some ways myself to settle the problems with the Soviet Government and if I would succeed in that then, certainly I can expect the help from the Indian side also."

ये दो बिल्कुल परस्पर-विरोधी बातें हैं। कहीं झूठ इस में है। कोई न कोई झूठ बोल रहा है। अब यह कहा जा सकता है कि स्वेतलाना झूठ बोल रही है, तो यह बाद का मामला आ जाता है, जब बाद में वह मुकदमा चले। प्रीव्हेलेजी तो मामला तय हो गया कि मंत्री लोगों ने इस सदन को गुमराह किया है। इस महिला के बारे में मंत्रियों ने बाकायदा चिट खुद अपनी तरफ से दी है। यहां के मंत्रालय के लोग उस से मिलने के लिए गए उस ने जो कुछ लिखा, वह यहां बताया। उस को इतना अच्छा समझा कि उस की राय को इस सदन के सामने रखा। इस से यह बिल्कुल साफ़ साबित हो जाता है कि असत्य बोला गया।

मैं ने आप के सामने असत्य के मामले में, जो कि विशेषाधिकार में से संबंध रखता है, तीन गुण बताए हैं : एक, कोई बात झूठ बोली जाय, दूसरे सत्य के किसी अंश को छिपाया जाये और तीसरे, यह सब जान-बूझ कर किया जाये—पहले दो में से कोई एक गुण हो और वह जान बूझ कर किया जाये, अगर ये गुण मौजूद हों, तो विशेषाधिकार का मामला निश्चित रूप से आ जाता है।

तो यह तो बिल्कुल साफ़ है कि विदेश मंत्री अथवा व्यापार मंत्री ने सीधा असत्य बोला है और उसके साथ साथ सत्य के अंश को छिपाया है। प्रधान मंत्री की बात मैं अलग से कहे देता हूं। उन्होंने तो दोनों काम किये हैं। मेरे सामने खाली यह सवाल रह जाता है कि उन्होंने जान-बूझ कर किया है, या अनजाने में कर दिया।

चागला साहब ने एक बात बिल्कुल साफ़ कह दी। ऐसा हो सकता है कि कोई कहे कि दिनेशसिंह जी की तो इन से कोई बातचीत नहीं हुई। दिनेश सिंह जी अपने को बचाने के लिए ऐसा कह सकते हैं। इसलिये मैं चागला साहब का वह बयान बताए देता हूं जो 3101 सफ़हे पर दिया गया है :

"Since yesterday when the Chairman asked me to get an assurance from Shri Dinesh Singh I have personally talked to him"

चागला साहब यह कह चुके हैं कि दिनेश सिंह जी से बातचीत कर के उन्होंने सब कुछ किया है। चागला साहब ने जान बूझ कर यह काम किया है, उस का मैं एक और प्रमाण दे देना चाहता हूं जो 31 मार्च की बहस में आया, चागला साहब ने जवाब देते हुए कहा

"Now what happens? She comes on a Russian passport with a visa for two weeks The visa expired. If we were so minded to get rid of her, we could have said: 'well, your visa has expired; you have to go back'. But we did not say that I was asked by some hon. Member .."

इस में विदेश मंत्री जी ने सदन को जान-बूझ कर गुमराह किया है क्योंकि उन्होंने सदन के दिमाग में यह बात डाल दी कि जैसे दुनिया भर के और नागरिक होते हैं, वैसे ही रूस के नागरिक होते हैं, वे जहां कहीं जाते हैं वहां अपना पासपोर्ट लेकर जाते हैं, जहां चाहे अपना वीसा मांग सकते हैं और स्वेतलाना जी ने इसी तरह किया -पहले उन्होंने वीसा मांगा, जो उन को दे दिया गया और फिर उन्होंने वीसा नहीं मांगा। वह जानते हैं, सदन जानता है कि वह सदन को बड़े ठोस ढंग से यह बता चुके हैं कि स्वेतलाना जी का पासपोर्ट रूसी दूतावास के पास कुछ घंटे पहले तक था। इस लिए यह सवाल ही नहीं उठ सकता है कि उन्होंने जा कर वीसा मांगा हो। रूसी सरकार की अपनी अलग पद्धति है, जिस पर मुझे आज कुछ नहीं कहना है।

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

लेकिन यह बिल्कुल साफ़ बात है कि बीसा मांगने का सवाल जब चागला साहब उठाते हैं, तो वह जान बूझ कर सदन को गुमराह करते हैं कि स्वेतलाना जी बीसा मांगने की स्थिति में थीं। इस लिए चागला साहब का मामला तो बिल्कुल साफ़ साबित हो जाता है कि उन्होंने जान-बूझ कर इस सदन से बहुत सी बातें छिपाने के लिए या गलत बातें बताने के लिए यह सारा किस्सा गढ़ा है।

अब रह जाता है सवाल दिनेश सिंह जी का। दिनेशसिंह जी के बारे में मैं ने आप से पहले भी कह दिया है और आज भी दोहराएदेता हूं कि स्वेतलाना जी ने जो पहली चिट्ठी 10 फ़रवरी को कालाकंकर से इलाहाबाद लिखि थी, उन्होंने यह जो चिट्ठी लिखी है, उन्होने जो बातें इलाहाबाद लखनऊ, बनारस में न जाने किन किन लोगों से की हैं, अजीब तक से की है, मुझ से की है, उन में उन्होंने दिनेशसिंह जी के बारे में क्या कहा है। अगर आप मेरी बात को महत्व न दें, तो वह अलग बात है। चागला साहब का हमेशा शब्द होता है, "सालम एशोरेंस"। मेरे पास "सालम" और "अनसालम" का तो कोई फ़र्क नहीं है लेकिन मैं कोशिश करता हूं कि मेरी जीभ से कोई अनसालम बात न निकले। मैं ने हमेशा यह कोशिश की है। मैं यहां बताना चाहता हूं कि स्वेतलाना जी ने बिल्कुल साफ़ तौर पर दिनेशसिंह जी के बारे में मुझ से कहा, "देखा, मुझ को यहां रहने नहीं दिया जा रहा है।" वह कोशिश कर रही थी भारत सरकार के आदमियों के जरिये, या ऐसे आदमियों के जरिये, जिन को वह महत्वपूर्ण समझती थी, कि भारत सरकार उन को यहां रहने दे। मैं ने उन से कहा, "देखो, मुझ को महत्वपूर्ण न समझो। मैं तो एक ही तरह से तुम्हारी मदद कर सकता हूं। अगर तुम लड़ना चाहो तो तुम मेरे घर में आ जाओ, तुम यहां आ कर रहो तुम जबर्दस्ती रहो और तब हम लोग जा कर इस मामले को आगे लड़ेंगे।" उस के सामने दो पन्थ थे। यह पन्थ उस को उस वक्त कबूल नहीं था। अगर कबूल हो गया होता. यह सही है कि मैं पहले भी इस मामले में कमजोर रह चुका हूं। एक और अमरीकी महिला की मैं रक्षा नहीं कर पाया।

एक माननीय सदस्य : माननीय सदस्य केवल महिलाओं के मामले ही क्यों उठाते हैं?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उस को यहां से जबर्दस्ती निकाल दिया गया था। तो इस लिए भी यह मामला तो खत्म होता है।

अब सवाल उठता है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कैसे विशेषाधिकार का हनन किया है। मैं आप के सामने 666 सफ़हे की कार्यवाही का एक अंश पढ़े देता हूं, जो कि 21 मार्च को हुई थी। श्री नाथ पाई ने एक बहुत बढ़िया सवाल पूछा था। मैं फिर अंग्रेजी में पढ़े देता हूं। मैं उमीद करता हूं कि आगे मुझे ऐसा नहीं करना पड़ेगा। "Did she not request the Prime Minister?"

यह सीधा सा सवाल था।

"Shri M C Chagla: No".

प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां सदन में बैठी हुई थीं। मैं यहां की पार्लियामेंटरी प्रैक्टिस के उद्धरण नहीं पढ़ना चाहता। जब कोई आदमी झूठ के सामने चुप रहता हुआ बैठा रह जाये, तो ससदीय पद्धति के अनुसार वह उस का सहभागी समझा जाता है। तो इन तीनों ने सब मामले में सदन को गुमराह किया है।

अब सवाल यह उठता है कि जो चिट्ठी मुझे मिली है, वह चिट्ठी कैसी है। स्वेतलाना जी ने जो चिट्ठी कालाकंकर से लिखी थी और जो चिट्ठी उन्होंने श्वेड से लिखी है, उन दोनों की लिखावट की मैंने तुलना की है और उन दोनों चिट्ठियों की लिखावट एक ही है।

अब सवाल यह रह जाता है कि वह यहां से गई क्यों। इस सदन के, और चाहे

तौर से इधर के लोगों के, मैं एक विनय करूंगा कि वे बार-बार इस सवाल को न उठायें कि उस के यहां से जाने में, भागने में, किन किन लोगों ने मदद की। भारत सरकार ने मदद की, या सी० आई० ए० से मदद की और या खुद रूसियों ने मदद की, कौन जाने। हो सकता है कि रूसी दूतावास में कोई मर्मज्ञ रहा हो, कोई दिलपसन्द आदमी रहा हो, जिसे पुरानी बातों की याद आ गई हो और जिस ने इस दुखी महिला की मदद करनी चाही। किसने मदद की, मुझे इस से मतलब नहीं है। सवाल यह है कि यह दुखी औरत है। इस दुखी औरत ने यहां रहना चाहा, पृथ्वी माता की भारत माता के रूप में शरण लेनी चाही—मैं जान बूझ कर "पृथ्वी माता" कहूंगा—और उस को यहां रहने की अनमति नहीं मिली वह औरत सिर्फ रूसी नहीं है, बल्कि वह आज रूसी तो रह ही नहीं गई है, क्योंकि—मैं चागला साहब की तारीफ करूंगा, क्योंकि उन्होंने यह एक बड़ी बात स्वीकार की—वह अजेयसिंह की पत्नी थी। उद्धरण में बिल्कुल साफ है। वह स्वीकार कर चुके हैं। कानून को छोड़ दीजिए। वह पत्नी थी। इस का मतलब यह है कि वह भारतीय की पत्नी थी। इस का मतलब है कि भारतीय नागरिकता के कानूनों के अनुसार अगर वह चाहे, तो एक सैकंड में भारतीय नागरिक बन सकती है। मैं आज एक रूसी के बारे में नहीं बोल रहा हूं—मैं एक भारतीय नागरिक के बारे में बोल रहा हूं और मेरा दिल, और सब लोगों का दिल, छिना हुआ होना चाहिए कि उसको यहां नहीं रहने दिया गया।

उसके साथ साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि मैं एक मनुष्य और औरत के बारे में बोल रहा हूं। वह भारतीय न हो, इस को छोड़ दें। मैं एक मनुष्य और औरत के बारे में बोल रहा हूं। उस के साथ कैसा बर्ताव हुआ है ? और इस लिए मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि हम सब को इस तरफ ध्यान देना है। कल मैंने आप से जो इजाजत मांगी थी, वह केवल इस लिये कि मेरा बड़ा लांछन होता रहता है। कल मैंने आप को आठ बजे टेलीफोन किया था। साढ़े आठ बजे टेलीफोन किया था फिर आप के सचिवालय को टेलीफोन किया था। मैं अपनी आदत के खिलाफ भी आप के यहां 9 बजे आना चाहता था। मुझे कोई खबर नहीं मिली और फिर इन के यहां मैंने अपने सारे बयान दस बजे तक पहुंचा दिये थे। पूरा एक घंटा था फिर भी माननीय सदन मुझ को लांछित करता है, और कोई नयी बात नहीं, जो कोई नया काम करना चाहते हैं उन का अपमान हुआ ही करता है। मातृ-भाषा को लेकर पिछले पन्द्रह वर्षों से मेरा अपमान हुआ। कुछ थोड़ा सा यह सदन ख्याल रखे। लगान के मामले में मुझको आप लोगों की जितनी चिन्ता है .. (व्यवधान)... कुछ ज्यादा ही चिन्ता है। लगान में खत्म करना चाहता हूं। अकाल के मामले में... (व्यवधान) बार बार हल्ला मचाया जाता है ....(व्यवधान)....अब उधर से कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न.....

Mr. Speaker: Please conclude now.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस लिये मैं आप से अर्ज करूंगा कि यह कभी किसी को नहीं कहना चाहिये कि इस सदन का वक्त खराब किया जा रहा है। एक मनुष्य का मामला है और एक ऐसे मनुष्य का जिस को इस पृथ्वी में अपना सिर जाति के साथ रखने के लिये जगह नहीं मिल रही है ऐसे मनुष्य के लिये, जहां हम अपने पेट के मामले को हल करें वहां इस दूसरे मामले को भी हल करना इस सदन का न केवल कर्तव्य है बल्कि धर्म है। इस लिये मैं आप से विनती करूंगा कि आप इस मामले को विशेषाधिकार समिति में भेजें।

संसद कार्य तथा सचिव मंत्री (डा० राम सुभग सिंह) : श्रीमान्, माननीय डा० लोहिया साहब ने जो विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न

[डा० राम सुभग सिंह]

प्रस्तुत किया है उस में मेरा एक संशोधन है क्योंकि उन्होंने स्वयं कबूल किया और बड़े दिल से कि माननीय विदेश मन्त्री ने कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कही जो सत्य के विपरीत हो और और भी जो वाणिज्य मन्त्री और प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में उन्होंने बातें की तो वाणिज्य मन्त्री के साथ जो बात हुई उनकी वह उन के साथ हुई थी स्वेतलाना से और डाक्टर लोहिया से, उस का लिखित स्वरूप हम लोगों के पास नहीं है और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो जवाब दिया माननीय श्री नाथ पै जी के प्रश्न के उत्तर में वह हाउस के रेकार्ड पर है। तो इन सारी बातों के चलते मैं यह संशोधन रखता हूं कि :

इस सभा की राय में सदन के विशेषाधिकार का परराष्ट्र मन्त्री, वाणिज्य मन्त्री और प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा कोई उल्लंघन नहीं हुआ है ।

Shri Dattatraya Kunte (Kolaba): On a point of order, Sir. A motion contrary to the original motion could not be an amendment. It is substitute motion.

श्री मधु लिमये : ठीक कह रहे हैं।

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): I fully support it. I should say that Dr. Ram Subhag Singh should have been better advised by his colleagues as to the validity of the kind of amendment that he has moved. Kindly look at rule 226. It says:—

> "If leave under rule 225 is granted, the House may consider the question and come to a decision or refer it to a Committee of Privileges on a motion made either by the member who has raised the question of privilege or by any other member."

Now, the motion before the House is that it should be referred to the Committee. What is his amendment? Does he want it to be referred to the Committee or not?

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: No.

श्री नाथ पाई : जरा सब्र से सुन लीजिये ।

Sir, I have been misdirected. If we were debating Dr. Lohia's original proposal, if the House was seized of the motion in substance, that amendment would have been valid and relevant; but the motion before the House is that we refer it to the Privileges Committee. Therefore the motion is out of order and irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker: How is it out of order?

Shri Nath Pai: Let me answer it.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Lohia is referring it to the Privileges Committee because he thinks that a *prima facie* case is there, but Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's opinion is that there is no *prima facie* case for it to be referred to the Committee.

Shri Nath Pai: I beg of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to follow the proceedings a little more diligently and, if possible, more intelligently.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Intelligence is not the monopoly of Shri Nath Pai. He is not in a position to claim monopoly of intelligence.

श्री नाथ पाई : गुस्से में मत आइए, जरा सुन लीजिये ।

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Why should he make such remarks?

श्री नाथ पाई : आप बड़े बुद्धिमान हैं इसीलिए मैंने कहा ।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : हां, तो विनय ठंडा करके कहिये न ।

श्री नाथ पाई : इसी लिये मैंने कहा न ।

I am extremely sorry, if Dr. Ram Subhag Singh got the impression that I do not credit him with a lot of intelligence. Precisely because you are intelligent. I submitted that you should follow it intelligently. . (*Interruption*). Sir, the first stage was that you put the motion and then asked whether there is any objection. The second stage is that the leave is granted. Now, the third stage is either we debate the substantive motion here and now or we refer it to the Privileges Committee. The motion before the House being that we refer it to the Privileges Committee, the objection which ought to have been raised at the earlier stage cannot be raised now. The rules are very clear; the precedents are very clear. The objection that Dr. Ram Subhag Singh is trying to raise ought to have been raised earlier when Dr. Lohia sought the leave of the House. The leave has been granted and the substantive motion before the House is whether we refer it to the Privileges Committee or not. That is the only question. There cannot be an amendment like that. Either we do not refer it to the Privileges Committee or we debate it here and now. The amendment moved by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh cannot be made. The rule is very clear.

Mr. Speaker: I think, Mr. Nath Pai almost made it clear. The motion could also be voted down. He is opposing the motion. It is not as though it is accepted by the House. The motion is before the House.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: There is one thing that I want to say. Mr. Nath Pai has been trying to make out that I could have objected to the motion before it was moved. How can that be done once the House grants leave to that being moved here? It is only after that anything can be done. Therefore, I moved this amendment.

Shri Govinda Menon: I think, we should understand the nature of the motion before the House. The question is not whether it was right or wrong in not giving asylum to this particular lady. The question is not whether she went to Switzerland with the help of America or C.I.A. agent or India or anybody else. The question is not.. ..

श्री मधु लिमये : यह काहे पर बोल रहे है? आप की व्यवस्था क्या हुई? . . . (व्यवधान) अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह भाषण कैसे कर सकते है? नाथ पाई ने व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाया है ।

Mr Speaker: I am trying to understand the issue.

श्री मधु लिमये : तो उस के ऊपर सुनिये न । सबस्टैंटिव मोशन पर कैसे वह बोल सकते है ?

Mr. Speaker: Not on the substantive motion. I want to hear him on the issue raised by Mr. Nath Pai that an amendment cannot be moved to the motion that is before the House. Later on, he can explain the other things.

Shri Govinda Menon: The substance of the amendment is that there is no case for the motion to go to the Privileges Committee.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: No, no.

Shri M. R. Masani: Sir, the statement made by the Law Minister proves Mr. Path Pai's point. The Law Minister just admitted that the substance of the amendment is that there is no case for referring it to the Privileges Committee. In that case, the amendment is out of order. Rule 344(2) clearly says:

> "An amendment shall not be moved which has merely the effect of a negative vote"

According to the Law Minister, this amendment has the effect of a negative vote. So, this amendment is out of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जहां तक डा० राम सुभग सिंह की तरमीम का सवाल है आप 344(1) देखिये । मेरा ख्याल है नाथ पाई का व्यवस्था का सवाल बिल्कुल सही दुरुस्त है । 344(1)

"(1) An amendment shall be relevant to, and within the scope of, the motion to which it is proposed."

डा० राम सुभग सिंह का संशोधन न रेलीवेंट है न इस दायरे में आता है क्योंकि इस का दायरा है कि समिति के पास यह मामला भेजा जाय । अगर यह तरमीम होती कि समिति 15 दिन के अन्दर रपट दे, दस दिन के अन्दर रपट दे, सब लोगों को सुने, तो यह इस दायरे के अन्दर आ सकता था । लेकिन समिति के पास मामला भेजने की बात बिल्कुल खत्म है । जहां तक मेनन साहब की बात का सवाल है, एक तो उन को इजाजत नहीं देनी चाहिये थी क्योंकि मामला आगे बढ़ चुका है, दूसरे मेनन साहब ने कहा है कि उनकी तरमीम खत्म हो जाती है । इस लिये डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया के द्वारा जो प्रस्ताव लिया गया है, उस पर बहस जारी रहनी चाहिये ।

13 hrs.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that any further discussion on technical points is necessary. The purpose of the amendment, according to Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, is that it is not only opposing, it, but the facts as stated by the Foreign Minister.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Yes; the facts stated by the Foreign Minister, etc., are correct.

Mr. Speaker: It has the effect of being a negative one..and naturally..

श्री मधु लिमये : उस दायरे में नहीं है, इरेलेवेंट है ।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: They can vote it down.

Shri Dattatreya Kunte : I have already raised a point of order that an amendment which is in opposition to the substantive motion could not be moved as an amendment and that point of order has not yet been decided by the Chair.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : (दिल्ली सदर) : मेरा कहना यह है कि उस का असर, चाहे डा० राम सुभग सिंह ने कुछ भी कहा हो, . . .

Mr. Speaker: Every one is referring to the same thing.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि यह अमेंडमेंट मूव नहीं हो सकती है । उस का एक ही रास्ता है कि जो प्रस्ताव डा० लोहिया ने रखा है, उस को वोट-डाउन किया जाय . . . . .

Mr. Speaker: He is repeating the same thing

The House stands adjourned for lunch and will meet again at 2 p.m.

13.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

MOTION OF PRIVILEGE RE. MRS. SVETLANA ALLELENVA AFFAIR contd.

Mr. Speaker: After Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia moved his motion to refer the question of privilege to the Committee of Privileges, Dr. Ram

Subhag Singh moved another motion to the effect that the House is of the opinion that no breach of privilege or contempt of the House has been committed by the Minister concerned.

A point of order was raised that this motion moved by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh was out of order as it was in the nature of an amendment to the original motion of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, and under rule 344 (1) an amendment has to be relevant to and within the scope of the motion to which it is proposed.

I have heard all the points of view, both for and against this point of order. I am of opinion that rule 226 is a self-contained rule, so far as the motions relating to the question of privilege are concerned. Rule 228 reads as follows:

> "If leave under rule 225 is granted, the House may consider the question and come to a decision or refer it to a Committee of Privileges on a motion made either by the member who has raised the question of privilege or by any other member.".

This rule envisages that either one of the two motions or both the motions can be made under this rule. The original motion of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia states that a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege has been made out and the matter should be referred to the Committee of Privileges for investigation. If this motion is voted down, it only means that the matter is not referred to the Committee of Privileges, and the substantive part of the question of privilege namely whether a breach of privilege or contempt of the House has been committed remains, and the House has to give a decision on the merits of the case.

Therefore, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh is within his right to invite the House to come to a decision whether any breach of privilege or contempt of the House has been committed.

I rule that both the motions are in order and they should be put to the vote of the House one after the other. First, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia's motion will be put to the vote of the House, and if it is not carried, then Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's motion will be put to the vote of the House.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): On a point of order....

Mr. Speaker: After the ruling there can be no point of order on it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I want to understand your ruling. I do not always with our submisaions.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Many Members are engaged in voting in the first floor, in connection with election to committees. If you put this question to vote now, those Members will not get a chance. They are doing a function of this House, and so, it should not be put to vote now; it should be put to vote only after 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I only wanted to understand your ruling. According to your ruling, there are two motions before the House, whereas Dr. Ram Subhag Singh moved the motion as an amendment to the motion moved by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. So, it is not a motion by itself....

Shri Nath Pai: It was only an amendment. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh himself had said: '*Main samshodhan pesh karta hoom*'.

Mr. Speaker: I have already given my ruling. Whatever he might have said, I have given my ruling already.

Shri Nath Pai: We can help you always with our submissions.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That is what we understood. He gave it as

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

an amendment. You take it as two separate motions. Will that mean that the motion to refer it to the Committee of Privileges....

Mr. Speaker: Not only that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He has given his reasons why it should be referred to the Committee because there is a *prima facie* case. After rejection of that, of course the question of privilege remains. But are we now discussing whether there is a *prima facie* case or not or whether there is any breach of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: Both are there.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Are we discussing both the things together?

Mr. Speaker: Naturally.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Therefore, I am still in doubt....

Mr. Speaker: After my ruling, can this discussion go on?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I want a clarification.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Lohia's motion says that a *prima facie* case has been established and therefore, I should go to the Privileges Committee. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's motion says that there is no case made, it has not been proved, therefore, it need not go to the Privileges Committee. Both are separate motions. You may understand the latter motion as an amendment, but I treat it as a separate motion.

Shri Nath Pai: I think we should get a chance to argue the case.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह बहुत पेचीदा मामला है आप सुनिये ।

Mr. Speaker: After listening to the ruling, these points are being raised.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Metals (Shri P. C. Sethi): Can the Speaker's ruling be challenged?

An hon. Member: *No.*

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): Dr. Lohia has moved a motion for having this matter referred to the Committee of Privileges because a *prima facie* case has been made out. That is the view. Whether a *prima facie* case can or cannot be substantiated is a matter which can be gone into by the Committee of Privileges — that is the purport of his motion. Here is a motion which you call an alternative motion which purports to say that the substantive aspect of the matter has already been determined by the House. How can that be so?

Mr. Speaker: Am I to understand that the ruling is being discussed?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: No, What I am asking is, how can we consider both these motions together?

Mr. Speaker: May I request Shri Chagla to reply?

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: First of all, I have to seek some information from the Chair by way of clarification. Is the House being called upon to discuss two motions at one at the same time? If so, under what rule?

Mr. Speaker: It is all right.

Shri Nath Pai: We want your guidance.

हमें आप के इस निर्णय पर दुःख है हम यही कह सकते हैं ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): On a point of order....

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: There cannot be two motions before the House at the same time.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The two motions cannot be taken together.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: I ask whether the two motions are going to be discussed at the same time. They should be discussed one after the other. I am not questioning the admissibility of the motion.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूं, मैं चुनौती नहीं दे रहा हूं ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My point of order is under rule 226. You have quoted that rule. I do not challenge your ruling. I shall surely bow to it. You have already ruled that if leave under rule 226 is granted, the House may consider the question and come to a decision or refer it to a Committee of Privileges on a motion either by the member who has raised the question of privilege or by any other member.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is under rule 226 (*Interruption*). Unless you hear me, I will not be able to make myself clear. This morning after the question hour and call-attention motion you in your wisdom announced your decision taken perhaps in your chamber after due consideration that this was a matter where a *prima facie* case had been established. So you allowed Dr. Lohia to bring this motion before the House. This was brought, and a question was raised....

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am coming to that. A point of order is not one point.

Mr. Speaker: Please make it brief.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me. When Mr. Masani suggested that this matter might result in an acrimonious debate, and so it should be referred to the Privileges Committee .....

Mr. Speaker: You are making a speech. How long can you go on? Without mentioning the point of order, you are making a speech, what Mr. Masani said, what somebody else said. What is the point of order? Tell me in one sentence now. (*Interruptions*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Am I answerable to you or to them? My point of order is this. I want a clarification also.

Mr. Speaker: That is exactly the difficulty.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: According to me it may be unfortunate, according to you it may be *prima facie* wrong, anyhow I bow down to your ruling, but I would only invite your attention to this, in the form of a point of order, that previously also when there was a privilege motion against Mr. Madhu Limaye and there was an amendment from us, Mr. Surendranath Dwivedy wanted to move an amendment because the session was coming to an end and some damage might be done to Mr. Madhu Limaye in the eyes of the electorate by referring such matters, the Speaker, in his wisdom disallowed it, and under this rule 226 the Speaker referred this matter to the Committee of Privileges.

According to rule 227,

"Notwithstanding anything contained in these rules.... (*Interruption*)

I am quoting precedents, I am entitled to do it.

Mr. Speaker: You are entitled to raise a point of order, but not to make a speech in the name of a point of order. Certainly not. That is unfair. What is the point of order. Tell me in one sentence.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly let me finish. What I am telling you is that

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

if the ruling is accepted, it should be accepted by all, that is a different matter, but this will be setting a bad precedent, because previously.....

Mr. Speaker: Will you please resume your seat? I request you.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am concluding.

Mr. Speaker: You are making a speech, you are questioning the ruling and everything else. Please sit down.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I appeal to you....

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: Before the ruling is given.....

Mr. Speaker: The ruling has been given already.

I have heard your point of order Let me hear his.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have not concluded.

Mr. Speaker: In the name of a point of order, a speech cannot be allowed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There are conventions in this House....

Mr. Speaker: Please resume your seat.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is virtually wrong.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: Sir, I will read rule 226 again along with you:

> "If leave under rule 225 is granted, the House may consider the question and come to a decision or refer it to a Committee of Privileges on a motion made either by the member who has raised the question of privilege or by any other member."

Therefore, there ought to be only one motion, and not two motions. The rule is very specific, "either by a member or any other member", but there has to be only one motion. When the Chair has ruled that there are two motions under rule 226 I am really trying to understand how there can be two motions. The Minister in charge of Parliamentary Affairs might move a separate motion, but on this motion..

Mr Speaker: That is exactly what I have said.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You can see the record.

Mr. Speaker: In my ruling I have said it is a separate motion, and that motion is also entitled for the consideration of the House What is wrong, I cannot see really.

श्री मधु लिमये : उस की नोटिस नही है। मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है। उस को आप सुने ।

श्री अ० क० चागला खड़े हुए ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है। मंत्री महोदय अभी कैसे बोल सकते हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order There is some confusion.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह गलतफहमी और कन्फ्यजन मैंने नही पैदा किया है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि यह निर्णय किस चीज के बारे मे है। आप नियम 226 देखिये। उस में दो प्रक्रियाये हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: There can be no point of order on my ruling.

श्री मधु लिमये : रूलिंग पर नहीं है। इसी लिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि आप मुझे सुनिये।

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is already a point of order.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: My point of order is on that point of order. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: How can all speak at the same time?

श्री मधु लिमये : उनको बैठाना आप का काम है, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठा रहा हूं । मेरे बाद वह बोलें । मैं कहां मना कर रहा हूं । वह पचास प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठाये ।

Mr. Speaker: You can raise a point of order after he has finished.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कहां मना कर रहा हूं । मेरी समझ में नहीं आ रहा है । वह पचास व्यवस्था के प्रश्न उठायें ।

Shri M. R. Masani: There is some misunderstanding. My friend seems to think that you are calling on the Minister to reply to the debate. On the contrary the debate is going to start. I have asked you for permission to speak in the debate. Let the debate commence. Am I right, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Naturally. The ruling is clear. Let us see what time should be allotted to this. I think one hour would be a reasonable time. It s now 2.15. Let us now proceed with the debate and take a decision. Mr. Masani.

Shri M. R. Masani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to support the motion moved so ably and, if I may say so, with great restraint by Dr. Lohia this morning. Supporting the motion does not mean that we agree that anyone is lying. That does not mean that either Mrs. Svetlana is lying or that the two hon. Ministers concerned have misled the House. It simply means that between the document placed before the House by the Minister and the Minister's statements, and the letter that has now been received by Dr. Lohia, there quite clearly apears to be conflict of testimony. The purpose of referring this matter to the Privileges Committee is that it is a small, quasi-judicial body set up by all sections of this House to carry out the purpose for which it was constituted. to call the ministers, to call all concerned and then to come to a conclusion whether the privileges of the House had been violated or not. This is the correct position.

I am surprised that there should be any opposition to this motion. I am only sorry that you did not respond to my plea this morning that it should be referred to the Privileges Committee without a debate. Then all this argument could have been avoided. Now, what does it mean when the motion is opposed? What does the amendment of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs mean?

An hon. Member: It is not an amendment; it is a substitute motion.

Shri M. R. Masani: All right—what does the alternative motion mean? I am sorry that the hon. Parliamentary Affairs Minister, who is a man of great integrity and for whom I personally have great regard and admiration, should have allowed himself to be made a party to this amendment or motion. What it means is this: that instead of facing an enquiry by the appropriate quasi-judicial body, competent to do so, in a quiet, dispassionate manner, this alternative motion asks the House, after one hour's debate, by a majority, to ascertain who is telling the truth ann who is not uttering the truth. It is an attempt, if I may say so, to resort to People's Justice in place of the Rule of Law.

Shri Govinda Menon: The point is.....

Shri M. R. Masani: I am not yielding to the hon. Minister, Sir, let me proceed. I am very sorry that this counter-motion should have been brought. I came to this House with a very open mind. I did not know whether there was a direct clash of evidence and if so who was telling the truth. I thought the hon. Ministers concerned would have welcomed a reference to the

[Shri M. R. Masani]

Committee of Privileges and by a judgment of their own peers, quietly and judicially ascertained and then have a final debate in this House.

The act that they are burking a discussion, the fact that they are evading this enquiry, drives me to the very unpleasant conclusion—I do not mind saying that, with sadness—that if this motion of Dr. Ram Subhag Singh is carried by a majority that could not possibly apply its mind to the intricacies of the two documents, I shall then be forced to come to the conclusion that Madame Svetlana is telling God's truth and that those who are contradicting her are guilty of misleading this House and are unfit to hold their offices any longer.

I therefore once again appeal to my hon. friends, the Ministers concerned, and to my hon. friend the Mover, to withdraw this unfortunate motion which is lacking in ordinary parliamentary honesty and decency and to allow this matter to go before the Committee of Privileges, and nobody would be happier than I if the report of the Committee of Privileges comes and says, "Neither of the hon. Ministers told a lie, there was a misunderstanding in the matter, and the matter can be honourably dropped." If that is not done, then by the very vote on this resolution, this House will convict these Ministers of being unfit for holding office.

श्री बलराज मधोक: मैं डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया के विशेषाधिकर के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूं। जिस समय यह प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने रखा गया था तब मैंने आपके द्वारा सदन से प्रार्थना की थी कि इस प्रस्ताव को इसी रूप मे विशेषाधिकार समिति के पास भेज दिया जाय ताकि सदन के अन्दर इसके बारे में एकिमोनियस डिबेट न हो, कटुविवाद न हो और जिसमे बहुत कुछ छिछालेदार होने की सम्भावना है। वह न हो। मगर मुझे दुःख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आपने और सदन ने मेरे सुझाव को स्वीकार नहीं किया। उसके बाद जिस प्रकार डा० राम सुभग सिंह दूसरा प्रस्ताव लाए वह इतना ही है कि हम लोग इसको नहीं मानते हैं। अगर सिम्पल मैजेरिटी से विशेषाधिकार की बात तय होनी है तो मैं आपके द्वारा सदन से पूछना चाहता हूं कि विशेषाधिकार समिति बनाने का प्रयोजन क्या है? जहां तक मैं समझता हूं उसका प्रयोजन एक ही है जब ऐसी बातें उठती है जिनके बारे में केवल वोट के द्वारा निर्णय नहीं हो सकता है, उन पर विस्तार से विचार करना होता है, एवीडेंस देना और लेना होता है, कुछ ऐसी बाते भी होती है जो कि सारे सदन में नहीं कही जा सकती हैं, वहा कही जा सकती है तो उनको उस समिति के पास भेज दिया जाय। वहा यदि इस पर विचार होता और वह भी अपना पक्ष रखते, डा० लोहिया भी अपना पक्ष रखते, एवीडेंस रखते और उसके बाद जो निर्णय होता वह सब को मान्य होता। परन्तु जो ढग अपनाया गया है उससे लगता है कि जो चार्जिज या जो बातें डा० लोहिया कह रहे है उनके बारे मे इन लोगों का पक्ष बहुत कमजोर है। अगर इनका पक्ष मजबूत होता तो इन्हे कोई आपत्ति न होती। मैं समझता हू कि उन्होंने ऐसी बाते कह कर स्वय अपने आपको सदन की नजरों मे और देश की नजरों मे गिरा दिया है। ऐसा करके न उन्होने अपनी सेवा की है न ही सदन की सेवा की है और स्वेतलाना की सेवा इन्हो ने करनी ही क्या थी। इसलिये मैं प्रर्थना करता हूं कि अभी भी मामला बिगडा नही है। वह अपना प्रस्ताव वापिस लें। इसके ऊपर और डिबेट न हो और सारी चीज को प्रिवलेजिज कमेटी के सामने पेश कर दिया जाय।

Shri Krishan Kumar Chatterjee: I am not convinced about the necessity for the privilege motion. Even if the allegation of Dr. Lohia were true, that is no basis to consider that

to be any contempt of the House or breach of privilege of the House. The privileges of this House are from the date of the Constitution, i.e. 26-1-50. Before that, our privileges were the same as the privileges of the House of Commons. Upto 26-1-50 there has been no instance in *May's Parliamentary Practice* in which any Mis-statement or incorrect statement by a Minister was treated as contempt of the House or breach of its privileges. In 1963 for the first time the House of Commons resolved that Mr. Profumo, the then Defence Minister, had been guilty of a grave contempt of the House by making a statement which he later admitted was not true. Before that date, there is no precedent. The relevant date is 26.1.50, when our Constitution was adopted. The previous Speakers of this House used to refuse to treat alleged incorrect statements by Ministers as amounting to contempt of the House or breach of its privileges.

In 1951, Shri C. Subramaniam and Shri Ram Nath Goenka, MPs. gave a breach of privilege notice against the then Commerce Minister for making an incorrect statement in the form of Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the Indian Tariff Amendment Bill, 1951 The Speaker, Mr. Mavalankar gave this ruling:

> "The substance of the allegation seems to be that the Minister concerned or the Government have not made the fullest disclosure or have made misleading statements. This may be regrettable, but I do not understand how this constitutes a breach of privileges even if it be assumed that the failure to give full or correct information was intentional."

This was the ruling of that great Speaker, Mr. Mavalankar.

In 1958, Shri A. K. Gopalan alleged "calculated distortion of facts" given to the House in answer to certain questions concerning the LIC, which matter figured in the proceedings before Justice Chagla involving the responsibility of Shri T.T. Krishnamachari, then Minister and Secretary H. M. Patel. Shri Gopalan alleged inconsistencies between the statements made in the House and the evidence led before Justice Chagla. The then Speaker, Mr. Ayyangar ruled thus:

> "I have not been convinced about admissibility of the notice. I am going to to rule that it is not admissible. No contempt proceedings can be started on this allegation even assuming this allegation to be true. Inconsistent statement is a mere irregularity even if deliberately made. Even if a Minister should have made one statement here and deliberately omitted to state or deliberately made an incorrect statement, that may be a matter of misconduct.. Misconduct on the part of a Minister might not be raised by way of contempt of the House. There are other measures such as censure, etc"

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आपने जो फैसला किया है, उस पर वह बोल रहे है। आपने लोहिया जी के प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार किया है और बहस भी चल रही है।

Mr. Speaker: When the opposition members speak, they can also go on raising points of order. Then, where will it lead to? If you have any important point to raise, you may do so after he finishes his speech. For Heaven's sake don't do it now. Let us hear both sides.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कहां मना कर रहा हूं। इस तरह से अन्याय के सामने मैं नहीं झुकूंगा। मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि वह एडमिसिबिलिटी पर बोल रहे हैं। उस पर आप फैसला कर चुके हैं। वह बोलें मैं उनको मना नहीं करता हूं। उनको आप पन्द्रह मिनट

[श्री मधु लिमये]

दें, मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। लेकिन एडमिसिबिलिटी पर बोल रहे हैं।

Mr. Speaker: It may be so. But you can raise it afterwards. There will be no fruitful discussion if it goes on like this. Everybody can rise in his seat. When an hon. Member talks from this side it may look reasonable from his point of view, but hon. Members on the other side may feel that it is not very reasonable. Where will it lead us to?

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji. I am not questioning the validity.

Mr. Speaker: Do not go into the merits of it.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: Sir, in August 1966, Shri Madhu Limaye, the hon. Member who is present here now, and others brought up a motion of breach of privilege against the then Home Minister, Shri G. L. Nanda about a certain statement appearing in the *Statesman*. you will remember, Sir, according to the allegations of the *Statesman* certain information had been given to the paper through the sources of the Ministry Shri Nanda had denied it. The ruling given by the then Speaker, Shri Hukam Singh may be seen at pages 6765-66 and page 6783 of the Lok Sabha proceedings dated 24-8-1966 From the proceedings you will find that though the Speaker disallowed the motion the arguments advanced for doing so were neither based upon precedents in India or the House of Commons. . .

Mr. Speaker: This motion is before the House.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterjee: Sir, one more point and I have done I want to draw your attention to Rule 224(3) of the Rules of Procedure.

Mr. Speaker: Again you are going into the rules. You are confusing the issue. The motion is now before the House already. You are arguing about the admissibility of a case which is already before the House. You have taken the whole time in *arguing about the admissibility of it.* The motion has already been admitted. I do not know what you are doing.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: Sir, my submission is only this. The facts disclosed by Dr Lohia do not warrant any privilege motion. Madam Svetlana is a private personality. Also, she is not an Indian. As such this is not a matter for the Indian Parliament to intervene The facts as disclosed have not substantiated anything We have not been able to verify if the correspondence quoted was actually written by her. Again, even the letter *mentioned suggests* that there has been no intervention on the part of any Minister as such. A private individual who happens to have relation with her because of her marriage with his cousion might have said something in a private way. That should not be any cause for penalising a Minister or the Prime Minister or the Minister of External Affairs. The Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs have made it perfectly clear The Minister of External Affairs took the House into confidence and categorically denied that ever an attempt was made by Madame Svetlana to take permission of the Indian Government to stay here Indirectly, Dr. Lohia says, by remaining silent the Prime Minister also conceded this. This is a vague and absolutely fantastic charge against her Therefore, I suggest that the motion be thrown out

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: SIF, we find that there are two motions before the House, the original motion merely placing cerain facts before the House and asking us to refer them to a Committee of Privileges to find out how much truth is contained in them and whether the Ministers concerned have

made any statements which are untrue; and another motion which *prima facie* admits the untruth of those statements and yet wants to say that no breach of privilege has been committed. I really fail to understand if it is the privilege of a Member to tell untruth, much more so of a Minister, and then to plead that no breach of privilege has been committed. I really do not know to what stage this House can go. Therefore, it would have been really better if the original motion of the hon. Member who moved it to be referred to the Privileges Committee, where it could have been discussed dispassionately, had been accepted. The Committee of Privileges could have examined the truth or untruth of the statements made and later on made its report. That report could have then been discussed here. But the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has rushed in to say, possibly by the number of votes that is at his command, what is truth is untruth. This is a very curious manner of deciding the fate of truth or untruth. Therefore, at one stage I was trying to point out that there ought to be only one motion before the House. There is an opposition motion which says: let us take this matter to the Committee of Privileges. There is another motion which says "it does not matter if the statements made on the floor of the House are untrue; all the same, we will say that no breach of privilege has been committed". This is really derogatory to the past practices of this House and, therefore, I oppose the second motion and I support the first motion moved by Dr. Lohia.

Shri K. Narayana Rao (Bobbili): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no necessity for us to enter into a long discussion. The issue is very simple. We know the extent or area to which we can hold a particular Minister responsible to a House of Parliament. In the course of debates, in the course of discussions we may raise all sorts of problems and we may oftentimes try to pin-point him or get a categorical answer from him. In such situations one is put between the two horns of a dilemma. So, the important factor to be borne in mind is to what extent is it relevant to the vigilance of the Government.

Coming to the facts of the case, this is the case of a private citizen who has come here on a Russian passport. When she comes to India on a Russian passport, the Government of India has a certain amount of responsibility to Russia in the sense that a Russian national was taken into the Indian Union. So, it is not merely a question of a private citizen called Mrs. Svetlana as Dr. Lohia tried to make out. The moment a foreign national is taken as a citizen of the Indian union, it becomes a problem of the relationship between two countries. So, once a Russian citizen has been adopted as an Indian citizen, the Russian Government has got a right to express its view. We cannot simply adopt any citizens we like. Even a Minister of the Government has no right to commit himself to an understanding to adopt a foreign national as Indian citizen in a situation of this nature.

That being the position—I am not going into the merits of the case or what transpired in the conversation between that person and the Minister—in a context like this it should not excite the House so much. We need not bother about it so much. Even in the parliamentary context of things, there is no possibility of any Minister committing any sort of breach of privilege in a situation like this. So, I would appeal to all hon. Members to throw out the motion moved by Dr. Lohia.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I bow down to your ruling, though I must say that I was very much distressed when I heard your ruling. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh has played history, not good history, a history which the House will lament later on. This is the first time that a motion to refer a matter of privileges to the Committee of Privileges is sought to be defeated by the sheer strength of numbers. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh was

[Shri Nath Pai]

under a duty to try to extricate his colleagues, the Ministers, who found themselves in difficult water. But, instead of summoning logic, instead of summoning facts, instead of depending upon reason, he has chosen the path of depending upon the path of brute force of numbers. Mr. Speaker, it will be a very sad day when the House will try to solve such questions for which deliberately our founders, the founders of the Constitution and the predecessors in Parliament in the Central Assembly created the delicate mechanism of the Privileges Committee. When an issue is not very clear, when it appears that something must be investigated, the matter is referred to the Privileges Committee. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, whose first concern should be to strengthen these institutions of Parliament, he is trying to scuttle and destroy them for the benefit of his party.

This will be the only case, I repeat, where a motion to refer a matter to the Privileges Committee is sought to be defeated I would like one single example in the long history of the Central Legislature and of the Lok Sabha when a motion to refer a matter to the Privileges Committee was sought to be defeated.

Now I will come to another thing. Like Shri Masani, though not exactly, I had an open mind though I was feeling very gravely disturbed and, therefore, I had raised questions. It is very unfortunate that the unhappy life of an unhappy young woman has come to be debated so publicly ... (*Interruption*) It is a matter of judgement as to who is young and who is old I think, we should try to forget the partisan overtones which try to creep in and remember that we are dealing with a human tragedy, with an unfortunate story of an unfortunate woman. Let us completely keep away the USA and the USSR and just look to our duty and that too not from the partisan point of view of PSP, Congress etc. but as Indians. In this regard let us try to recall the tradition of this country.

I do still think till Shri Chagla is in a position to prove to the contrary that this young woman was somehow enamoured with this country, was fascinated with this country, was enchanted with this country. She wanted to stay in this country. You may be disillusioned with India but there are many who fall in love with India and this girl fell in love with India. I know, you are creating an India which Indians find very difficult to live in but many outside still have a glamour, a fascination, an attraction for India. This is the simple thing. I do not think, had Svetlana been allowed to stay here, Shrimati Gandhi need not have entertained any fears, she was not going to engineer a revolution against the Soviet Union and had she thought of that then, of course, the almighty security of India could have been invoked against her. But she just wanted to stay here and lead a private life.

What is the truth about this? I do rely upon the veracity of the letter. It is an agonising thing which should move every Indian. Everybody who did not find shelter anywhere else came to the shores of India. Our forefathers came to the Ganges from Volga. It was a repetition of that history once again. I was told by the great Hindi scholar, Rahul Sankratyayana, the author of *Volga to Ganga*, that from Volga we came That history was being repeated here. The daughter of Volga was coming once again to seek refuge on the banks of the Ganges and those who are sitting on the banks of the Ganges were turning their back on her because they were worried and petrified by fear. The worse feature of the whole episode is that where sympathy was called for, where pity was called for, where love was called for, fear was the only thing that dominated the judgement of Shri Chagla and his colleagues.

I do not at this stage think it proper to charge him with telling lies to the House. It is for this reason that the calm reflection, deliberation and mature judgement of the Privileges Committee ought to have been summoned to help the House reach a judgement on this delicate issue. Shri Chagla has not perhaps told a lie but he is a good lawyer—at least, he was before he became a politician—and he has delivered some of the best judgements enriching the Constitution of India. I may remind him of a proverb in Latin —I hope, he has not forgotten his Latin as he has forgotten some law recently It is *suppressio veri suggetio falsi*. Suppression of the truth is telling a lie. I do not say that he told a lie but I must say that he was wandering in the twilight land between suppression of truth and telling of falsehood and the borderline is very difficult to decide.

What he said was, "No asylum"; what he said in this House was, "No marriage" and what he to'd the other House was that she was married; but I do not go into details. Shri Chagla is shaking his head. I may quote him. My heart is affected, not my memory. I will quote him. In reply to my question in this House—the lights are rather dim—

> "This Ministry somehow is getting notorious about its lack of ability to handle affairs where women are concerned, whether it is Reita Faria or Svetlana Stalin. I should like to ask, though he has said categorically, decisively, resolutely and emphatically also, in spite of all these adverbs which he has used, whether it is not a fact that this unfortunate lady did pathetically plead, not for extension of visa....
>
> "....and ask for permission, not once but repeatedly...and whether it is not a fact that she made a request personally to the Prime Minister also..."

What does Mr. Chagla say? It is in this context that the matter must be raised and the House must make up its mind whether India is not departing from her traditions of providing shelter. Forget she comes from Russia. Just remember a human soul, a young woman, wanting shelter in your land, not to carry on revolution here, not to damage the name of the Soviet Union. All she said, "I want to live in the land of the man I loved whose religion I accepted and whose culture I accepted." What is the crime? If anybody has been guilty, it is not this unfortunate lady but who denied her the permission to stay in India. They did not only deny the permission but the heritage of India. This is my greatest charge against Mr. Chagla.

What does Mr. Chagla say? He says:

> "It is absolutely incorrect to say that this lady made any request to the External Affairs Ministry, to any Minister or to the Prime Minister, to stay on in this country. Leave aside a pathetic request....

—this is in reply to my question which I raised earlier—

> "....but even an ordinary request was not made."

There was the usual chorus of applause when he mocked at my word 'pathetic'. Then, he goes on to say:

> "I have said it before and I repeat that we extended the visa and there was no question or suggestion that she wanted to stay on in India."

In conclusion, may I say this? I do not accuse you of telling lies; I do not go into that. But by avoiding the calm and deliberate scrutiny by the Privileges Committee, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh is showing his fear and fret and is creating an impression which will be extremely difficult to resist, a conclusion which will be unaviodable that they have been telling lies. This is not what I want to say but this motion, if it is carried, will mean an indelible, inescapable and unavoidable conclusion which any sane man in this

[Shri Nath Pai]

House and, perhaps, your masters who are watching your actions, the people of India, will be reaching Try to help them to reach a correct impression.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा (बाढ) . अध्यक्ष महोदय,मैं श्रीमती स्वेतलाना के बारे मे कुछ अभी तक नही बोली थी । पर आज यह मौका मिला प्रिविलेज के मामले को लेकर तो मैं कुछ कहना चाहती हू । चार पाच दिनो से बहस जो हो रही है श्रीमती स्वेतलाना के बारे मे तो मुझे ऐसा मालूम होता है, इस पार्लियामेट मे मुझे इस बात का एहसास नही था अध्यक्ष महोदय, कि यहा इतने गालिब, मीर, बच्चन, टैनीसन, बायरन यह सब के सब इकट्ठे हो गए हैं । अध्यक्ष महोदय,मैं हैरान हू अखबारो मे स्वेतलाना के बारे मे निकला .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया मीरा बाई का नाम और जोड लो . (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य आप इस तरह से बीच मे बाधा डालेंगे तो हम भी इसी तरह करेंगे । . . (व्यवधान)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया मैं मदद कर रहा हू । मैंने कहा कि मीरा बाई का भी नाम ले लो ।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा मैं यह कहना चाहती हू कि एक तरफ तो डाक्टर साहब की दरियादिली पैमाने से बाहर हो गई है और दूसरी तरफ दूसरी महिला खडी हुई है तो इस तरह से बोलने नही देना चाहते । (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय , मेरा समय बर्बाद हो रहा है तालियो मे, मुझे बोलने की इजाजत दी जाय ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इसलिये इस बात को कहना चाहती थी, क्योंकि मुझे याद है जिस वक्त यह मामला शुरू हुआ था, मुझे भी विरोधी दलो के नेताओ से हाउस के अन्दर या बाहर बातचीत करने का मौका मिला था और मैं समझती थी कि यह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत के लिये एक महत्वपूर्ण घटना थी । अमरीका और रूस के सम्बन्धो के बारे मे इस का महत्व था तथा इसके साथ साथ हमारा इस मे क्या सरोकार होना चाहिये था, हमारी क्या उपयोगिता होनी चाहिये थी, हमारा क्या महत्व होना चाहिये था, इस बात को लेकर हमारे अन्दर एक भावना काम कर रही थी और यह काफी महत्वपूर्ण चीज थी, जिस के बारे में हम गौर कर रहे थे, विचार कर रहे थे । उस के बाद पता नही वह चीज कहा चली गई । रूस और अमरीका का इस घटना से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत पर क्या असर होगा, यह सब बाते पीछे हट गईं, तथा श्रीमती स्वेतलाना का दिल कितना दुखाया गया, इसकी चर्चा होने लगी । इस विषय को, अध्यक्ष महोदय, तीन चार दिनो से बराबर सुन रही हू । यहा और वहा दोनो जगहो पर इसकी चर्चा हो रही है । आज जितने लोग, दिल की धडकनो को देखने वाले लोगो से मैं यही कहना चाहती हू कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोगो, करोडो लोगो के दिलों की धडकनो को वे पहले देख लेते, उस का अहसास कर लेते, उस के बाद बाहर के दिलो की धडकनो का अहसास करना उन के लिये ठीक था ।

इन्होने प्रिवलेज की बात उठाई हैं । हमारी डाक्टर साहब से बातें होती हैं, उनकी हम से होती हैं

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया आपके दिल की धडकनो से भी बाते होती हैं ।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह उधर से होती होगी, लेकिन मेरी तरफ से नही होती हैं ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सफाई की जरूरत क्यों पडी ?

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : मैं इस बात को महत्व इसलिये देना चाहती हूं कि हम इस सदन को चलाने का क्या तरीका बना रहे हैं। जो बाहर की बातें होती हैं, जो प्राइवेट बातें होती हैं, यदि उन पर हमने यहां पर तवज्जह देना शुरू किया, तो उन का कोई अन्त नहीं होगा। मेरे साथ भी, अध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसी दुर्घटना हो चुकी हैं, मेरे ऊपर भी इल्जाम लगाये गये, पच्चीसों बार मैंने फैसला किया कि मैं संसद में वक्तव्य दूं। परन्तु मुझे बड़े नेताओं ने, वकीलों ने, जिन में श्री सीतलवाड जी का नाम भी आता है, उन्होंने कहा कि यह तरीका जो संसद को चलाने का है, उस में आप अगर कोई बात कहेंगी और उसके बाद मिनिस्टर साहब उस बात को काट देंगे तो आपकी बात को मान्यता नहीं मिलेगी। श्री सीतलवाड और श्री फ्रैंक एन्टनी साहब ने मुझ से कहा कि श्रीमती सिन्हा, आप कभी ऐसी गल्ती न करें, क्योंकि मिनिस्टर साहब जब कोई वक्तव्य देंगे तो कोर्ट में जाने में परेशानी होगी। मैं उस को चुपचाप बरदाश्त करती रही। मैं पूछना चाहती हूं विरोधी दलों के सदस्यों से, जब हमारे लोगों की मान्यताओं पर इस प्रकार के प्रश्न उठाये जा रहे थे, तब उन्होंने यह सवाल क्यों नहीं उठाया। हम कुछ परिपाटियों से बंधे हुए है, परम्पराओं से बधे हुए है। और मैं आपकी तवज्जह इस तरफ़ दिलाना चाहती हूं कि हमेशा यह परम्परा रही है कि अगर कोई गैर-सरकारी आदमी बाहर कोई वक्तव्य देता है, संसद के अन्दर नहीं, उस के बाद यदि मंत्री का वक्तव्य हो जाता है तो मंत्री के वक्तव्य को अधिक मान्यता दी जाती है, गैर सरकारी वक्तव्य को मान्यता नहीं दी जाती है। अगर आप इस परम्परा को तोड़ेंगे तो यह समस्या की शुरुआत होगी, अन्त नहीं होगा।

मैं एक चेतावनी देना चाहती हूं इस संसद को, एक सदस्य की हैसियत से अपने आपको भी चेतावनी देना चाहती हूं कि अगर ऐसी बात यहां पर हुई तो जितने भी 40-50 करोड़ आदमियों की बातें हैं, उन को हमें यहां पर उठाने के लिये बाध्य होना पड़ेगा, स्पष्ट है कि इस तरह से संसद की परम्परायें नहीं चल सकेंगी।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है, कि आप आज अध्यक्ष के पद पर बैठे हुए हैं। आपको इस बात का फैसला करना है कि कहां प्रिवलेज होता है, और कहां प्रिवलेज नहीं होता है। हमारे माननीय सदस्य एक बात का खाका खींचे, कुछ घटनायें पेश करें और उस को प्रिवलेज का रूप दें, मैं उन से भी एक घटना का जिक्र करना चाहती हूं। सन 1951 में जब श्री सी० सुब्रह्मण्यम और श्री रामनाथ गोयनका ने, दोनों इस सदन के, इस लोक सभा के सदस्य थे, एक प्रिवलेज का नोटिस उस समय के जो कामर्स मिनिस्टर थे, उनके खिलाफ़ दिया। श्री मावलकर उस समय हमारे अध्यक्ष थे। उन्होंने यह मामला रखा था कि कामर्स मिनिस्टर ने गलत बयानी की है। उन्होंने इण्डियन टैरिफ अमेण्डमेन्ट बिल, 1951 के आब्जैक्ट्स एण्ड रीजन्स में, जो कि एक बड़ा वैलिड डाक्यूमेन्ट होता है, इल्जाम लगाया कि उस के ऊपर गलत-बयानी की गई है। मामला बहुत पेचीदा था, बहुत सगीन था, बहुत महत्वपूर्ण था। मैं इसे आपको पढ़कर सुनाना चाहती हूं. . .

Mr. Speaker: Now, the hon. Member must conclude We have allowed only one hour for this. She nas already taken a lot of time and, therefore, she should conclude now. Shri Vajpayee.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे दो मिनट का वक्त और दे दीजिये, मेरा डाक्टर साहब ने बड़ा वक्त जाया किया है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अभी क्या है, जिन्दगी में बहुत वक्त खराब करना।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : वह वाक्य यह था, मैं इसे आपके सामने रखने की इजाजत चाहती हूं—

"The substance of the allegation seems to be that the Minister concerned or the Government have not made the fullest disclosure or have made misleading statements. This may be regrettable, but I do not understand how this constitutes a breach of privilege even if it is assumed that the failure to give full or correct information was intentional".

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस धारा को पढने के बाद उन्होने जो रूलिंग दिया था, उस के बाद मैं अदब से अर्ज करना चाहती हू कि ऐसे मामलो को उठाने के पहले आपको अपनी तरफ से इस बात का इजहार इस बात का फैसला करना चाहिये कि ऐसे मामले उठाये नही जाने चाहिये। हमे प्रिवलेज का जो महत्वपूर्ण अधिकार मिला है, अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सम्बन्ध मे हमने हाउस आफ कामन्ज की परम्पराओ को पाला है। वहा पर प्रिवलेज बहुत बडी चीज है। ब्रिटेन मे अभी हाल के वर्षों मे प्रिवलेज का एक ही मामला उठाया गया था और वह था प्राफ्यूमो का मामला। लेकिन यहा हम सुबह-शाम हर वक्त प्रिवलेज की बाते उठाते है—इस बात का अन्त नही होगा।

यह ठीक है कि यहा पर बहुत कुछ बाते कही गई है—मैं उस मली पर तरस खाती हू जिसको रिश्तेदार या दोस्त बन कर श्रीमती स्वेतलाना आई। डा० लोहिया ने कहा कि उन की शादी हो गई थी, डा० लोहिया खुद शादी नही किये हुए हैं, उनको मालूम नही है

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आपने धोका कब दिया।

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, शादी के कानून हुआ करते हैं। मैं उन को यह बताना चाहती हूं कि किसी की पत्नी अगर मौजूद रहती है तो हिन्दुस्तानी कानून के मुताबिक वह शादी नही कर सकता और श्री ब्रिजेश सिह की शादी उस मुताबिक, हिन्दुस्तानी कानून के मुताबिक नही हुई। श्री ब्रिजेश सिह की पत्नी, अगर वह जिन्दा हैं, मैं नही जानती क्योकि मुझे उनके बारे मे मालूम नही है, डा० लोहिया साहब को दूसरो के घरेलू मामलो की ज्यादा जानकारी रहती है . . (व्यवधान) मैं हाउस मे जानना चाहती हू—श्री ब्रिजेश सिह की दो पत्निया थी, अगर उन से से एक भी मौजूद है, तो क्या उन से डाइवोर्स लिया गया था, ताकि श्रीमती स्वेतलाना की शादी श्री ब्रिजेश सिह से हुई ? यह सब गैरकानूनी काम हुआ, मुझे पता नही सोवियत सरकार ने कैसे उन को अनुमति दे दी, यदि सोवियत सरकार ने उनको अनुमति दी है और इस प्रकार हमारे कानून का उल्लघन हुआ है, तो हम समझते है कि यह हमारे साथ अन्याय हुआ है, उन को अनमति नही दी जानी चाहिये थी।

दूसरी बात यह है कि यह सारी खिचडी सारे मामले मे एक महिला आती है। मैं मानती हू कि वह स्टालिन की लडकी हो, गुलाब का फूल हो, बहुत खूबसूरत हो, बहुत महत्वपूर्ण हो, बहुत अच्छी हो, मैं इन सब बातो को मानती हू, परन्तु यहां पर हम एक सरकारी फैसले की बात कर रहे है, पार्लियामेन्ट के प्रिवलेज की बात कर रहे हैं, यहा पर गुलाब के फूल और चमेली के फूल की बाते नही हो रही है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक महिला आती है, यहा रहती है, श्री दिनेश सिह अगर उन को अपने घर मे नही रखते तो कोई सवाल पैदा नही होता . . .

Mr. Speaker: We have only 15 minutes more left So, hon. Members may make very short speeches.

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : सिर्फ एक वाक्य पूरा करने दीजिये। मैं सिर्फ इतना ही

कहना चाहती हूं कि श्री दनेश सिंह अपने घर में नहीं रखते तो कोई बात पैदा नहीं होती। लेकिन आप के घर में आकर रहे, उठते, बैठते खाने की टेबिल पर, नाश्ते के समय, ड्राइंग रूम में हर समय कुछ न कुछ बातें होती रहती हैं। उन बातों की चर्चा अगर एक व्यक्ति इस तरह से करे, इस तरह से उन को इस्तेमाल करे कि वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय घटना हो जाय, तो मैं समझती हूं कि श्रीमती स्वेतलाना ने सरासर गलती की है। इस तरह से उनको नहीं करना चाहिये था। यह शोभा की बात नहीं है, जब दिनेश सिंह जी ने उन को रहने को मौका दिया था। इसलिये, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहती हूं कि यह मामला प्रिवलेज का नहीं है और इस को प्रिवलेज कमेटी में भेजने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा से सहमत हूं कि यह मामला गुलाब के फूल का मामला नहीं है, यह सदन के विशेषाधिकार का मामला है और सदन के विशेषाधिकारों का मामला किसी पार्टी का मामला नहीं है, यह सरकारी पक्ष का और विरोधी दलों का मामला नहीं है। यहां आरोप लगाया गया है कि स्वेतलाना के मामले में तथ्यों को दबाया गया है, सदन को अन्धेरे में रखा गया है। यह निर्णय कौन करेगा कि सदन को अनजाने में अंधेरे में रखा गया या जानबूझ कर अंधेरे में रखा गया ? क्या यह निर्णय मतों से किया जायगा ? यदि विशेषाधिकारों के प्रश्न को हम मतों का प्रश्न बनायेंगे तो फिर सदन के विशेषाधिकारों की रक्षा नहीं होगी। आज जो सरकारी बैंचों पर बैठे हैं वह कल प्रतिपक्ष में आ सकते हैं। उन का यह अधिकार सुरक्षित रहना चाहिये कि वे मंत्रियों से सही जानकारी प्राप्त कर सकें।

15 hrs.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, डा० लोहिया को लिखे पत्र में एक बहुत गम्भीर बात है। उस दिन श्री चागला से पूछा गया था कि श्रीमती स्वेतलाना से मिलने के लिए विदेश मंत्रालय के जो अधिकारी भेजे गये वह क्यों भेजे गये और वह क्या रिपोर्ट लाये ? डा० लोहिया को लिखे पत्र में उस अधिकारी के सम्बन्ध में बड़े गम्भीर आरोप लगाये गये हैं। श्री चागला ने कहा था कि वह अधिकारी इसलिए भेजा गया कि विदेश मंत्री स्वयं इस बात का विश्वास प्राप्त करना चाहते थे कि श्रीमती स्वेतलाना के बारे में जो कुछ कहा गया है वह ठीक है या नहीं लेकिन डा० लोहिया को लिखे गये पत्र में दूसरी बात कही गयी। उस अधिकारी ने वहां जाकर क्या किया उस के सम्बन्ध में श्री चागला का वक्तव्य सही है या गलत है इस का निर्णय कौन करेगा। उस अधिकारी को इस सदन में नहीं बुलाया जा सकता। उस अधिकारी को *विशेषाधिकार समिति में बुलाया जा सकता* है। श्री चागला ने गलत बयानी की, जान में या अनजान में, इस की तह में कौन जायगा ? अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे दुःख है, डा० राम सुभग सिंह से ऐसे प्रस्ताव की हमें आशा नहीं थी। मैं फिर इस बात को दुहराना चाहता हूं कि यह पार्टी का प्रश्न है। ईमानदारी का तकाजा तो यह था कि श्री चागला सदन से माफी मांगते और कहते कि मैंने कुछ गलत बातें कह दी हैं लेकिन अगर वे उस के लिए तैयार नहीं है तो मैं डा० राम सुभग सिंह से अपील करूंगा कि वह अपना प्रस्ताव वापिस ले लें या सारा मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति में जाना चाहिए। समिति में समिति के सदस्य दलों के आधार पर काम नहीं करेंगे। यदि समिति में जांच के बाद यह सिद्ध हो जाय कि किसी विशेषाधिकार का उल्लंघन नहीं किया गया है तो श्री चागला की कीर्ति बढ़ जायगी। उन के ऊपर झूठ बोलने का आरोप गलत साबित हो जायगा। लेकिन इस प्रश्न का निर्णय मतों से नहीं होना चाहिए। अगर मतों से इस प्रश्न का निर्णय होगा तो फिर सदन के विशेषाधिकारों की रक्षा नहीं हो सकेगी और

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

इस की जिम्मेदारी सरकारी दल पर होगी ।

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Nandyal): May I ask for a clarification from Dr. Lohia?

Mr. Speaker: Afterwards.

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । व्यवस्था मेरी यह है कि इस हाउस में यह गवर्नमेंट 50 मेम्बर्स रन कर रहे हैं और 50 मिनिस्टर्स के बाद, 50, 50, फिफ्टी, फिफ्टी हम और उधर के वह लोग हैं एक मेम्बर उधर से बुलाया जाय तो एक मेम्बर हमारी तरफ का बुलाया जाना चाहिए । हम इस बारे में आपका प्रोटैक्शन चाहते हैं और यह व्यवस्था होना चाहेंगे ।

Mr. Speaker: It is not a point of order; it is only an intended demand. The point is that only 15 minutes more are left. I thought I would call only leaders of groups. But if the House wants that other members also should be called and we should go on, I have absolutely no objection. We will then have to have two hours more. I have already got a list here and I am calling members according to that. In that the list of members from the Congress Party is exhausted. If others also want to speak, I have no objection.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: (Khammam): On this subject also a list is sent to you?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: We also want to express our opinion.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Please sit down.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I support the motion moved by Dr. Lohia for reference of this unfortunate matter for determination by the Committee of Privileges. I have been long enough a member of the Committee of Privileges to know that when we refer a matter to that Committee, it does no mean that we here and now decide the rights and wrongs of the proposition, but we want to have the matter settled by a quasi-judicial committee of this House. Therefore, I do not propose to go into the merits of the subject, in spite of the provocation very gratuitously given by the so-called amendment or the alternative motion which was put forward by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Some of us have fallen victims to that provocation, and incidentally the result of it has been a characteristically attractive speech by my hon. friend Mr. Nath Pai, but I am not going into the merits of the matter at all.

I would like only to say this, that things happen in our country or appear to happen which should never have been allowed to happen, and in the House situations are created on account of the monumental ineptitude of the administration, which situations should never in any normal parliamentary set up have been allowed to be created. That is the kind of thing which has been going on, and that is why we discover that a matter has arisen which possibly has certain delicate nuances and certain even international implications of which we are not very fully aware, but the position is this, that in this House statements are made by Ministers without reference to one another, that inconsistencies appear in whatever statement they choose to make out of their cranium which do not happen to fit together, and therefore the charge of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi* becomes only too readily available in our minds. This kind of thing has gone on too far. I believe there is a saying in English that those whom the gods destroy they first make mad. This Government has lost its head, they do not, they just do not know which way to turn, and that is why the house which the Congress built is now fal-

ling down like a pack of cards. "London Bridge is falling down, falling down, falling down". (*Interruptions*)

I am concluding. Here is a matter where on the motion of a member certain things arise which appear, according to your judgment, *prima facie* to be inconsistent with the statement made in the House with statements otherwise available. That being so, it should be referred to the Committee of Privileges There should not be any effort of the vile sort which has been made, surely under Cabinet guidance, by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to exonerate the Minister. There is no need to exonerate Ministers who have been charged with certain things, of which they might be very completely innocent I shall be the happiest man if our friends on the other side find themselves to be complete'y innnocent of the charge which has been brought by Dr. Lohia, but to exonerate even before the matter has gone to the Committee is an effort which requires to be scotched by this House. That is why I support the motion made by Dr Lohia.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: Dr. Lohia has said that he has received a letter from Mrs. Svetlana. I would like to know from House. I want a clarification,. . .

Mr. Speaker: What is the use of the clarification? You are asking Dr. Lohia for clarification. He has to reply to you. You are creating further complications. I am not allowing.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल दो बातें कहना चाहता हूं। यहां हाउस आफ़ कामन्सका और संसदीय प्रणालियों की जो कूटनीति किया गया। वहां की जो हुकूमत है, उस का जो साम्राज्यवाद है उसका जो गठन है उस को हम बिलकुल नापसन्द करते हैं हालांकि इंग्लैंड की पार्लियामेंट की और उन की जो प्रक्रियाएं हैं। उन की मैं इज्जत करता हूं। वहां पर मंत्री लोग बैठे है। उनके काम कैसे हैं ? इंग्लैण्ड की टोरी सरकार मे प्रोफ्यूमों नाम का जो मंत्री था, उस के असत्य भाषण को जब पकड़ा गया तो वह प्रधान मंत्री को जो चिट्ठी लिखता हैं, उसके दो जुमलों को मैं पढ़ूंगा :

"To my very deep regret I have to admit that this was not true, and that I mislead you, and my colleagues, and the House. I ask you to understand that I did this to protect, as I thought, my wife and family, who were equally misled, as were my professional advisers.

I have come to realise that by this deception, I have been guilty of a grave misdemeanour and despite the fact that there is no truth whatever in the other charges, I cannot remain a member of your Administration, nor of the House of Commons."

उस के बाद क्या होता है ? टोरी पार्टी के जो सदन के नेता थे, "आयन मेक्लीआड़' उन्होंने प्रस्ताव रक्खा अपने मंत्री के खिलाफ, और वह इस तरह है जो कि सर्वसम्मति से पास हुआ :

"That Mr. John Profumo in making a personal statement to this House on the 22nd day of March 1963 which continued words which he later admitted not to be true was guilty of grave contempt of this House". (Journal of the House of Commons, 1962-63)

यह इंग्लैंड की लोक सभा की परम्परायें हैं इसलिए संसदीय परम्पराओं के ऊपर मैं भाषण नहीं करना चाहता हूं।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि विशेषाधिकार समिति की जो पवित्र प्रक्रिया है उस के अर्थ कुछ माननीय सदस्य

[श्री मधु लिमये]

समझ नहीं रहे हैं ? विशेषाधिकार पूरे सदन के, एक सदस्य के और उस की समितियों के होते हैं, कांग्रेस पार्टी के कोई विशेषाधिकार नहीं हैं, स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के कोई विशेषाधिकार नहीं है, संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के कोई विशेषाधिकार नहीं हैं । इसलिए जब विशेषाधिकार की अवहेलना की जाती है तो पहले तो उस प्रस्ताव पर मतदान नहीं होना चाहिए, लेकिन अगर माननीय सदस्य मतदान करना ही चाहते हैं तो मैं डा० राम सुभग सिंह से जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या वह पहले इस बात का खुलासा देंगे कि वह मतदान के लिए कोई आदेश जारी करना चाहते हैं, कोई व्हिप जारी करना चाहते हैं ? अगर कोई भी व्हिप चलेगा तो वह सदन की अवहेलना होगी और उसके खिलाफ कल मुझे प्रस्ताव देना पड़ेगा ।

मैं सभी माननीय सदस्यों से अपील करना चाहता हूं कि हम इस प्रस्ताव पर गम्भीरता से सोचें कि इस में क्या कहा गया है । उस में कहा गया है कि प्राईमा फेसी केस है । इस के अलावा और कुछ नहीं कहा गया है । इसमें विशेषाधिकार समिति को यह मामला सौंप देने का सुझाव है जिस से कि जो सत्य है वह सामने आ जाये । सत्य से हम लोग इतना क्यों डरते हैं ?

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप का अनुग्रहीत हूं कि आप ने इस अवसर पर जब कि बीच आफ प्रिविलेज का सवाल हाउस के अन्दर है तब मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया । बीच आफ प्रिविलेज का प्रश्न ला कर जो लोग हम को कल रिप्रेस करना चाहते हैं, वह हमारे सामने एक नमूना रख रहे हैं और यह नमूना कांग्रेस के सामने रख रहे हैं ।

मैं डा० लोहिया से पूछना चाहता हूं कि जब उस लेडी ने उन से रिक्वेस्ट की कि वह हिन्दुस्तान में रहना चाहती हैं और यह वैचेलर थे तो उन्होंने यह क्यों नहीं कह दिया कि तुम मेरे घर में रहो ? जब वह यहां से चली गई तब उन्होंने उस के ढोल पीटना शुरू कर दिया । उस वक्त वह कहां पर सो रहे थे जब उस ने उनसे रिक्वेस्ट किया कि वह यहां रहना चाहती है । उस वक्त यह क्या कर रहे थे, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूं । (व्यवधान) यह नमूना है जो यह लोग हमारे सामने पेश कर रहे हैं ।

Some Hon Members rose

Mr Speaker: If anybody wants to put a question, I can allow that Mr. Umanath may take two minutes We have taken about an hour already.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai) But I am not to be victimised for your allowing others 10 or 15 minutes. I am speaking on behalf of a group

Mr. Speaker: Shri Vajpayee who spoke on behalf of a party took only two or three minutes. Mr. Mukerjee also took 3-4 minutes

Shri Umanath: I support the first doctor's motion and oppose the second doctor's Motion Apart from other reasons, for supporting the motion and opposing the other motion, the one reason and the most important reasons which I consider is, the conduct of the Congress party itself, which is going to be the sole reason why it should go to the Privileges Committee Because, as I see it in this entire affair, the conduct has been this: first, they started from shying away from the situation; now, they are trying to end up with showing their claws That is how the whole thing has gone. In this discussion, which was taking place in this House before, an important Member of the Cabinet, Mr. Dinesh Singh has to be

referred to; serious allegations were there against him in this affair. What happened both in this House as well as in the other house? I find one strange thing though serious allegations were pointed out during the two or three days when this question was referred to in both the Houses, Shri Dinesh Singh never faced the situation. I find it is a strange thing. Though Mr. Dinesh Singh was a Member of the House, a Minister of the Cabinet and of the Government,—he was in Delhi—it was Mr. Chagla—a strange procedure—who was meeting Mr. Dinesh Singh and asking for a statement and asking him "what is your view?", and it was Mr. Chagla who was conveying the statement to the House. That is how the whole thing has gone on. The whole thing has now gone to the country.

So, the first point is, why should the Government shy away from the situation, when an important Member has alleged certain allegations, when certain allegatoins are made, why should they shy away from it? That is reason Number One. My second reason is, normally, this question will go to the Privileges Committee. But now, an abnormal procedure is being followed by the Government. They have asked another Member of the Cabinet to move a motion like this: that means they want to suppress the usual procedure by using their majority. This happened during the previous session also, using their majority which they had in greater numbers than this slender majority which they have now. Using that majority they had suppressed so many rights of this House and so many rights of Members, and they have seen the result in the elections, and yet, they are not learning from history. It is said that history does not repeat itself, but one exception is the Congress party. It repeats history again and again; their own conduct is being repeated; it is going on.

Mr. Speaker: Let him conclude now.

Shri Umanath: I am concluding: I would like to say that this whole problem has become the country's property now. It is no more the property of this House So, since the whole country is interested, since crores of the public are interested in what the Government have done and are doing, the Congress party should not use its majority; if they use that majority it may not be suppressing the rights of the House but suppressing the feelings of the people. Also, if they repeat it, they will get another Uttar Pradesh and another Haryana which will take place here itself.

श्री रणबीर सिंह (रोहतक) : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है। डा० लोहिया मंत्री महोदय की बाबत जो कुछ कह रहे है वह एक प्राइवेट डाकुमेंट है, पब्लिक डाकुमेंट नहीं है। पब्लिक डाकुमेंट की आथेंटिसिटी उस में नहीं है। इसलिये यह लेजिसिमिबल नहीं है।

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Dinesh Singh): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am glad the hon Member Mr. Umanath also thought of me in this context. I did not say anything in the House or even much outside the House because the matter so far raised had been addressed to the Minister of External Affairs, and I naturally thought that it should be replied by him.

Many matters have been raised in this connection. I would not like to go into them because in many ways they relate to private matters of Madam Svetlana Alliueva and her family. She did come and stay with us, she was a friend of my uncle though never married to him and she talked to me as she stayed with us in our house; she had talked to us on various personal matters, about herself, about her family, and I would not like to take this up in the House, nor would it be proper to do so.

The hon. Member Dr. Lohia may want to make political capital out of it. I would not like to do so He has

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

himself mentioned that she went and saw him that she had told him that she would like to stay in this country. If he was so concerned about her, that would have been the time to take up this matter, because she was in India. Even if he had a sad experience in another case, he is not deterred by that sad experience from taking it up in this House. If he was genuinely interested that she should stay in this country, that was the time He knew she was going. Apparently he tried to persuade her to stay on, but she did not agree; she went away Now he wants to rake up the whole matter and tries to prove that the Government as wrong. (*Interruption*).

श्री मधु लिमये : आप आरोपित है और दूसरों पर आरोप करने जा रहे हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: He must have his say.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I would not like to reply to these interjections made by the hon Member. He is quite good at it. So far as I am concerned, the Foreign Minister has already clarified the position. Madam Alleleuva at no time asked me to take any steps to ensure that she should stay in this country. She did not ask me either to initiate anything for a political asylum or for permanent stay. I am not going into technical matters. Therefore, the position that has been taken by the Government is quite correct. I do not see how there is a question of any privilege in this matter.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : तब जाने दीजिये न प्रिवलेज कमेटी में ।

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have spoken on this subject already twice in this House and twice in the other House, I do not want to contribute more to the literature that has grown up around this unfortunate matter. Serious charges have been made against me and it is my duty to answer them. My friend, Mr. Nath Pai, who is sometimes carried away by the exuberance of his eloquence....

Shri Nath Pai: This is an old taunt. I know you are borrowing it from Churchill.

Shri M. C. Chagla: He has said something which I strongly resent. He asked me whether I have forgotten my law.

Shri Nath Pai: I said, it gives that impression.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Sir, I did not interrupt Mr. Nath Pai when he was speaking. I should be allowed to defend myself He asked whether I have forgotten the Latin saying *suppressio veri suggestio falsi*. I have not forgotten it. I have not also forgotten certain standards of integrity which I maintain throughout my life. I can assure my hon. friend, that I will not stay here even for a minute if I was asked to sacrifice even an iota of that. (*Interruptions*). My learned friend has been in the hospital; I am sympathetic to him He has not read the record If he had read it, he would not have made this charge. I propose to satisfy this House that every word of what I have said is true. You will permit me, Sir, 5 or 10 minutes to defend myself. Even my friend, Mr. Vajpayee, said that I have not been telling the truth There is nothing which I resent more than this. Say, I am wrong; I have made a mistake; I am fallible. I will accept all that. But if anybody tells me that I have told an untruth or I have tried to mislead the House, I will not stand it. If I am satisfied that I have done so, I will tender my resignation straightaway.

Let us look at Dr. Lohia's letter. I am prepared to establish every word of what I have said. He has quoted some passages. I will read passage by passage and satisfy this House that every word, every comma and semi-colon of what I have said is correct. (*Interruptions*). Please give me a patient hearing. I gave you a patient hearing. After all, I have been charged with a serious charge and I have a right to

defend myself before this House. Let us look at Dr. Lohia's letter. He says:

"Mr. Chagla made the following assertions in the course of the statement on 21st March:

"I have got the statement here with me.

'The Swiss Minister of Justice said on March 14 that both India and the United States have refused Mrs. Allilueva's request for asylum'.

Dr. Lohia's letter says this is correct. I have checked up the official record and it is not correct. That is what I said:

"This is incorrect."

Then I went on to say:

"The position is, she came, as I said, with a Soviet passport with a visa for a certain period. When she asked for the extension of the visa, we granted it. After that, at no time did she indicate any desire on her part to stay further in India nor was any request received by us from the Soviet Embassy or from her that she wanted to continue to stay in India."

Every word of this is true I was here talking officially because—I will come to the latter part afterwards—I was talking as the Minister of External Affairs. So far as the Ministry of External Affairs was concerned no request was received for either an extension of the visa or for a desire to stay in this country. Then I went on to say:

"Therefore, no question of giving her asylum in India arises. She came with a passport and if she wanted to stay further, we would have considered the question of extending the visa. The question did not arise because she never suggested she wanted to stay beyond the time the visa would expire, which was 15th March."

That was the first passage. Let us come to the second passage. This is what I have said:

"It is absolutely incorrect to say that this lady made any request to the External Affairs Ministry, to any Minister or to the Prime Minister, to stay on in this country."

This is absolutely correct. I am referring to me as the Minister of External Affairs. I am referring to the Prime Minister, to the position she occupies. I am referring to my colleague as the Minister of States as he then was. Then I went on to say:

"Leave aside a pathetic request "

Shri Nath Pai had made a great plea on this. I said:

"Leave aside a pathetic request was not made."

This is perfectly true. I went on to say:

"I have said it before and I repeat that we extended the visa and there was no question or suggestion that she wanted to stay on in India."

Now comes the last paragraph:

"Now a distinction has been made or sought to be made that I have merely stated that no request was made for her stay here either to the government or to the Minister, and the insinuation is that she might have made that request to Mr. Dinesh Singh in his personal capacity. I have the authority...."

This is not my knowledge; please note this:

"I have the authority to state to this House categorically that at no

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

time, either orally or in writting, did she make a request to him either in his capacity as Minister of State for External Affairs or in his personal capacity as a relation of hers through Shri Brijesh Singh. This is a categorical statement that I am making to this House."

This is the statement I received from the Minister of Commerce. The Minister of Commerce has explained under what circumstances this statement came to be made. Therefore, this was not my knowledge. What was my knowledge was as Minister which I had placed before this House. When I was asked, what about Shri Dinesh Singh's action in his personal capacity, it was my duty to ascertain from him what was the position Having ascertained it from him I came and placed it before the House *What is the untruth that I have told* this House. What is Shri Nath Pai talking about *suppressio veri*. It is all very well to know a little Latin Shri Nath Pai knows that a little Latin is a dangerous thing.

Now, Sir, let us come to the merits I am surprised at Shri Masani and also my hon. friend Shri Madhok saying that the reputation of the Government is at stake unless we go to a Committee of Privileges What was the rule enacted for? Let us have a look at the rule.

Rule 226 says :

> "If leave under rule 225 is granted, the House may consider the question and come to a decision or refer it to a Committee of Privileges on a motion made either by the member who has raised the question of privilege or by any other member."

Therefore, the rule themselves contemplate two alternatives open to this House, one to go to the Committee of Privileges, the other, to decide the question on merits on the floor of the House itself. The sole question is : is this a question which should go to a Committee of Privileges or is it a question which should be decided on the floor of the House? I cou'd not understand why some hon. Members have said that there is something disgraceful, something utterly bad in the suggestion made from this side of the House that this is a question which should be decided on merits in the House itself and should not be sent to the Committee of Privileges. Now, let me satisfy you why it should not go to the Committee of Privileges.

An hon. Member : You cannot satisfy us.

Shri M.C. Chagla : First, what it the issue before us?

Shri M.R. Masani : Who is lying, what is the issue

Shri M.C. Chagla : Shri Masani, will you have some patience? A statement made by an hon. Minister ...

श्री मधु लिमये : अनर कहा है ।

Shri M.C. Chagla : Shri Limaye, that is a very cheap jibe. It does not become the leader of a group to speak in that vein .. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : अभी आप ने श्री नाथ पाई को क्या कहा ?

Shri M. C. Chagla: I will tell you what the position is. You have, on the one side, a statement made by an hon. Minister on the floor of this House as to what the position is. On the other side—I am assuming this; this is not the case; if I have the time, I can show that there is no contradiction; Here I am only assuming—you have a letter written by a private individual, giving a different version. I am taking the extreme view. We do not know under what circumstances that letter was written or received. We do not know whether the contents of the letter are correct. Are you prepared for an investigation to take place because a private person challenges

the veracity of the statement of a Minister..... (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : उसी के बारे में सारा मामला है ।

Shri M.C. Chagla : Sir, this is a very serious matter.. I hope the House will bear with me. I agree that we must lay down the principles and procedure not only for ourselves but for the House. This is a very serious matter. As I said, some day hon. Members on the other side might be some Ministers.

श्री मधु लिमये : तो क्या हुआ ? हम आप की तरह भागेंगे नहीं ।

Shri M C. Chagla: Are you going to refer every case where a private citizen challenges the veracity of a Minister to a Committee of Privileges? Is this what you are going to lay down? If a matter of public importance is invo'ved, I can understand it. But what is the position here?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : The difference between a private person.. (*Interruption*):

Mr. Speaker : Order, order. The hon. Minister is not yielding.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : Sir, on a point of order. . . (*Interruptions*).

Shri Umanath: Sir, you can ask us to sit down but not the whole gang sitting opposite What is this nonsense? . . .(*Interruptions*). I have noticed it twice or thrice, whenever anybody speaks from this side, they go on shouting. Sir, you must tell them to stop shouting . . . (*Interruptions*). You are keeping quiet. I am not going to be cowed down by them. I ask them to shut up. . .(*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This is not the way. It is simply running commentary and shouting at every speaker going on. Both sides are doing it (*Interruption*). They must not do it. I appeal you. You can say something if he yields. Do not think of others; they shout from both sides. You can say something provided he yields, but he is not yielding.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: All this period I had not opened my mouth. When I spoke, Shri Chagla was listening but these people shouted. If this goes on there will be no end. I tell you, the House cannot be carried on like this even for a moment. This is not the way that the House should be carried on. If there is any Leader of te House, he should tell these people; otherwise, you cannot carry on. There must be some order somewhere.

I only wanted Shri Chagla to clarify whether the private individual that he was mentioning is an ordinary private individual or it is the person concerned who has written a letter like this. He must make a distinction between a private individual and the person concerned.

Shri A K. Gopalan (Kasargod): If this continues, till now there is only exchange of words, there will be exchange of blows also

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah : I will only make an appeal to you I would also request the leaders. The trouble starts from there. We have been keeping quite and they cannot charge us that we are shouting There is a running commentary from every Member of the Opposition. . . (*Interruption*)

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : Not even once did I open my mouth.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): May I make an appeal to my hon. friends here and there also? If we are going to have a repetition of this and if either side is going to say that it will retaliate, where shall we end? Where did it start? That also should be considered. I am not justifying anything done on my side. I

[Shri Morarji Desai]

must say that; that is not a question, of justifying anything. But if you look to human psychology, there should be patience shown by everybody. When an hon. Member is speaking and if, he is being interrupted all the while, there is a provocation. Even then I request my hon. friends not to be provoked; but, after all, because of that provocation we begin to threaten. Even when the Speaker is standing, somebody stands up. When my hon. friend is speaking, if any hon. Member there wants to say something, he cannot immediately stand up and do it, unless he yields ground. If all this is not followed by us, I feel we will be nowhere

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy : You cannot justify this. It is wrong.. . (*Interruption*):

Shri M. C. Chagla: Sir, I was trying to explain . . . . (*Interruption*)

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I have not even once opened my mouth. There is a limit to one's patience, I tell you. Some of us want decorum and prestige of the House to be maintained. We have been fighting for that for the last so many years but if this be the attitude, what Shri Gopalan has said probably may happen. You want the House to be reduced to that, I am quite convinced now . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri Morarji Desai: May I request the hon. Member not to be excited over this? I am not finding fault with anyone. I am only saying that all of us have to consider it. If in spite of that he keeps on like that, I think, we will be in a very sorry plight.

Mr. Speaker: Tempers are a little frayed. But one side, after all, cannot do it. Presumbly, one side starts something wrong; but the other side copying it cannot make it right. Therefore if these friends, who are saying that the trouble started from there, are going to copy them, are they doing anything right? Are you doing anything right? If you do something wrong and they copy it, they are not doing anything right. After all, the Minister is replying to a serious debate. So many allegations have been made.

I would request the whole House, including the Government and the Congress benches, and all of you, to hear him patiently and then Dr. Lohia has the chance to reply. The running commentary, now and then, is permitted but the continuous running commentary and shouting is not permitted. I may tell you how patiently people have been hearing you. Therefore, I would appeal to the Members that there should be a limit to the runing Commentary and Mr. Yadav should not go to the length of continuously shouting at everybody who speaks on this side. I would appeal to all Members to hear the hon. Minister with patience.

An Hon. Member: Why should there be a threat of blows? (*Interruptions*)

Shri M. C. Chagla: Sir, I was trying to point out to this House that the rule permits two alternatives, eiher to go to a committee or to decide the issue on the floor of the House itself. I want to explain to you why the Members on this side of the House have taken the decision not to go to a committee but to decide it here.

As I said, it would be the most dangerous precedent to lay down—I warn the hon Members opposite to bear this in mind—that every time the Minister's word is challenged by any private individual, by a private letter furnished in this House, you must go to the Committee of Privileges to decide that. Secondly, I could have understood it the matter was of public importance. It is a private letter. What is the question of public importance?

Shri M. R. Masani: Refusal to give asylum.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Here is a young Russian lady who comes here in her private capacity on a Russian passport with a visa granted by our Embassy in Moscow for one month. She comes here and stays in a private capacity with Mr. Dinesh Singh or his uncle Her visa expires. We renew it. Instead of returning to Russia, she goes to Rome and ultimately to Switzerland. Today, she is leading there the life of a quiet private citizen. She is not an Indian citizen We have nothing to do with her publicly or officially. What is the issue involved? The only issue involved can be: Did we refuse to give asylum? She herself does not say that she asked for asylum. Now, may I ask Dr. Lohia the champion of damsels in distress, this question?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब इसके मतलब हो गए सभी कांग्रेसी महिलाए ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: He knew this in January. According to him, in January, he had talk with her and he got evidence of her talk with various people. What was it? Did he ever approach the Minister concerned? If he had sent a word to me, that here is a woman who is being forced to leave our country, I would certainly have seen to it I agree with Mr Nath Pai that this is a country which has got a reputation of giving asylum to many refugees. Why did Dr. Lohia not approach us? What that shows I leave it to the House to judge.

One thing more I want to say and that is about the point raised by Mr Vajpayee. I told this House that I will not make a statement till I have myself checked the correctness of every statement I was going to make. For that purpose, I sent Mr. Jaipal to Switzerland. He had an interview with her. He came and reported to me and I was satisfied that what I had said was true. Now, take your mind to what the issue then was. What was being said was that she was kidnapped, that she had gone out of this country against her will, that she had been driven out and that we had done nothing.

Now let us go through the whole letter. Does it or does it not bear out what I said? This is what he said:

> "Mr Jaipal took the letter from me to Dinesh Singh to prove that nobody in India knew about any plan to defect and nobody helped .."

Shri Nath Pai: Read the previous sentence. This is precisely *suppressio.*

Shri M. C Chagla: I will read:

> "Mr. Jaipal did his best to explain to me that my talk with Dinesh Singh and his refusal were private "

which is perfectly true,

> ". that I should not consider that as a reply of the Government of India. I do not understand much in diplomacy, but I got the opinion, the certain opinion expressed by the Minister of State,— why should I neglect it? Or have I to say now that it did not ever happen?"

So, Mr. Jaipal explained to her, assuming that it is true, "look, you have not made any application to the Government, you have not made any application to the Minister; therefore, no application can be entertained; if you did make any application to Mr. Dinesh Singh in his private capacity, that is a different matter" What is wrong about this? What is untrue about this? What have I said which is contrary to this? You may see what emerges from this letter

This theory of complicity with the United States, the theory of complicity with the CIA agents, the theory that she was kidnapped, the theory that she was taken to the Airport in secrecy and bundled out, all that has been exploded. This letter conclusively shows one thing that this woman made up her mind—I do not know at what time, day or night; she did not want to go to Russia and she wanted to go somewhere else. The fact of the

[Shri M. C. Chagla].

matter is, the truth that emerges is, that she ultimately wanted to go to Russia, her children were there..

Shri M. R. Masani: Certainly not there.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Her children were there; that was her home, but at a particular moment of time, she changed her mind and said, "I would not go to Russia, I will walk to the American Embassy and ask for a visa". Whatever that may be, all that I want to say in conclusion is that it would be a bad precedent, a very bad precedent, to refer every complaint that comes from a private source against a Minister to a Committee of Privileges I would ask this House not to look upon it as a party question. Privilege is the privilege of the House and not of a party If you think that the matter is grave, if you think that it involves a public policy, if you think that the conflict is so serious that it cannot be reconciled, certainly go to the Committee, but do not waste more time, do not create more difficulties, do not allow repercussions on the international situation by having a Committee of inquiry, calling witnesses, the matter coming here again and there being a further discussion

Therefore, I strongly support the motion moved by Dr Ram Subhag Singh

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जनतंत्र का अर्थ है वादविवाद और बहस । और बहस का अर्थ है सत्य । जब तक सत्य न हो तब तक बहस नहीं हो सकती । जब तक बहस न हो तब तक जनतंत्र नहीं हो सकता । इसी आधार पर यह प्रस्ताव आप के सामने आया है । और अगर कहीं किसी देश में मन्त्रियों की आदत पड जाय कि वह किसी फंसाव के मौके पर असत्य बोल कर के अपने हटना चाहें तो फिर उस सदन का कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि विशेषाधिकार उतनी ही बार आये, रोज आये क्योंकि इंगलिस्तान का यहां उदाहरण दिया गया है तो वहां मन्त्रियों की आदत नहीं है झूठ बोलने की । वहां की जनता असत्य को पकड लिया करती है । मैं समझता हूं जल्दी वह दिन हमारे यहां भी आने वाला है जब हमारे यहां भी असत्य बोलते हुए राजनीति करने वाले लोग घबडायेंगे । इसलिए सब से पहली बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि खुद मन्त्री महोदयों ने बात को स्वीकृत कर लिया मरी है । क्योंकि श्री दिनेश सिंह ने केवल इतना कहा है कि स्वेतलाना जी की कही हुई बात झूठी है और कुछ नहीं कहा है । अब इस सदन के सामने बिल्कुल साफ सवाल आ गया कौन झूठा है? क्या स्वेतलाना जी झूठ बोल रही हैं या क्या दिनेश सिंह जी असत्य बोल रहे है ? मैं जानबूझ कर झूठ न कह कर असत्य शब्द का इस्तेमाल कर रहा हू हालांकि मतलब दोनों का एक ही होता है । कौन यहां पर गडबड कर रहा है ? इसलिए केवल यही एक प्रश्न रह जाता है और मैंने कहा है कि जो इन लोगों के बयानों की आन्तरिक गवाही है उस से भी साबित हो जाता है कि स्वेतलाना जी सही बोल रही है लेकिन मुझे अभी उस का फैसला नहीं करना है । विशेषाधिकार समिति के सामने इसलिए यह मामला जाना चाहिए । आखिर चागला साहब का यह कह देना कि यह मामला तो किसी एक व्यक्ति का है कोई मतलब नहीं रखता वह भी एक विशेषाधिकार का मामला हो जाता है क्योंकि जिस व्यक्ति का मामला है उसी को कहने का मौका नहीं दिया जाता है । स्वेतलाना जी का मामला है और स्वेतलाना कुछ कह रही हैं तो यह मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति के पास जाना चाहिए ताकि मालूम हो सके कि कौन सही बोल रहा है ..... (व्यवधान) मैं इस से नहीं घबड़ाता, खूब व्यवधान करिये

और वह संसदीय है हालांकि आप की तरफ वालों को जब इधर से बीच में चोटा जाता है तो बड़े घबड़ा जाते हैं वह लोग लेकिन ऐसे चोटने से मैं नहीं घबड़ाता। कोई बात नहीं है, मेरे बीच में व्यवधान करो यह बिल्कुल संसदीय है बीच में टोकना।

मैं आपसे यह निवेदन कर रहा था कि स्वेतलाना का और श्री दिनेश सिंह का मामला इतना साफ़ हो गया है कि विशेषाधिकार का इस पर निर्णय होना चाहिए और इसीलिए अब तक केवल एक भाषण उस तरफ से हुआ है जो इस विषय से सम्बन्धित है और वह श्री चटर्जी का है बाकी सब असंगत भाषण हुए। उन्होंने भी केवल श्री मावलंकर का हवाला देते हुए कहा कि सत्य को छिपाना ही केवल विशेषाधिकार नहीं हो जाता है। यहां सत्य को छिपाया नहीं गया है यहां असत्य बोला गया है। क्या स्वेतलाना ने हिन्दुस्तान में रहने की इजाजत चाही यह है सवाल? चाही तो असत्य बोला गया या नहीं, सत्य को छिपाने वाली बात नहीं है। दूसरी बात उन्होंने यह कही कि अगर कोई मंत्री एक बयान यहां दे दे दूसरा बयान कहीं और दे दे तो असंगत बातों को ले कर विशेषाधिकार नहीं हो सकता। सवाल यह नहीं है कि मंत्री अगर असत्य बयान दे दे तो क्या होना चाहिए? इसलिए बहुत ताकत के साथ मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि चाहे जूही जितना ज्यादा जले कि मैं चमेली और चम्पा के बारे में कुछ ज्यादा बोल गया लेकिन मैं जूही को बतलाना चाहता हूं कि मैं उस को भी कद्र करता हूं और मैंने कभी किसी मर्द और औरत के दिल की धड़कन को सुनना नहीं चाहा जिस ने पहले से स्वीकारात न हो कि उस के दिल की धड़कन को मैं सुनूं ऐसा जिंदगी में मैंने कभी नहीं किया है। इसलिए एक चीज मैं बिल्कुल साफ बतला देना चाहता हूं कि चागला साहब ने जो यहां पर बयान दिया है जयपाल साहब के बारे में उस का स्वेतलाना का जो सम्बन्धित वाक्य है वह मैं पढ़ दूं। मुझे फिर बड़े अफसोस के साथ अंग्रेजी पढ़नी पड़ रही है

"Mr Jaipal did his best to explain to me that my talk with Dinesh Singh and his refusal were private, that I should not consider that as a reply of the Government of India"

यह प्राइवेट बात थी यह उस की चिट्ठी में है। चागला साहब उसी चिट्ठी पर निर्भर करते हैं। अगर ऐसी बात है, तो चागला साहब खुद कह चुके हैं Whether officially or unofficially, privately or publicly, orally or in writing, उस वक्त तो बहुत ज्यादा फैल गये मगर अब घबराते हैं कि वहां पर ऐसी चिट्ठी लिख कर भेज दी है। जब एक दुखी औरत हो या सुखी औरत है इस बात को छोड़ दो। सवाल यह उठ आता है कि अब यहां पर रूस का भी मामला आ गया है तो जरा कुछ रूस की तरफ की जो चिट्ठियां आप के पास आई हैं वह भी इस सदन को मालूम होनी चाहियें क्योंकि मुझे तो एक बात मालूम होती है कि कोई बहुत गैर जरूरी ढंग से यह लोग घबड़ा गये हैं। गैर जरूरी ढंग से घबड़ा गये हैं। अब यहां पर आप देखें उनका यह कहना है कि रोम के इन्टरनेशनल एयरपोर्ट में यह लोग गये, घबड़ाहट में गये। क्यों गये? हल्ला मचा, मेरे जैसे आदमियों की तरफ से। वहां गये उस को कहने, जो कुछ भाई हुआ सो हुआ, चलो वापिस आओ। अब वह बेचारी क्या कह रही है?

"I refused because I knew that was a request of Moscow".

वह डर गयी। शायद मौस्कुआ ने भारत सरकार को कहा कि भाई उस को बुलवा लो वापिस और उसको उन्होंने यहां बुलवाना चाहा फिर न जाने क्या कर डालते? यह सब घबड़ाहट में मामले हो रहे हैं और आज

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

भी घबड़ाहट मे यह लोग बोल रहे हैं । क्योंकि न अच्छा हो एक दफा तो वह बोल दे जो सच बात हो, घबड़ा कर कभी यह कहानी बनाना, कभी दूसरी कहानी बनाना और कभी तीसरी कहानी बनाना यह तो अच्छा नही होता है ।

मुझ से बहुत लोगो ने कहा कि मैंने खुद क्यो नही उसकी मदद की (व्यवधान) मैं उसे महिला नही कहूगा । जिन औरतो की मैं इज्जत करता हू उन्हे मैं औरत कहा करता हू । लोगो ने कहा कि मैंने खुद उसकी मदद क्यो नही की ? मैंने तो मदद करनी चाही थी । वह बेचारी समझती थी कि अनुनय विनय से काम चल जायेगा । लड़ने के लिये वह तैयार नही थी । मुझे कुछ अनुभव हो चुका । चागला साहब ने कहा कि मेरी एक चिट्ठी का असर पड़ेगा । मेरी चिट्ठी ? यह जितने लोग यहा बैठे हुये है, मेरी चिटठी जायगी तो ठीक उससे उलटा यह काम करेगे क्योकि इनको मालूम है कि यह जो कुछ कह रहे है शायद हम लोगो की जड खोदने के लिये कह रहे हैं । मेरी चिट्ठी का असर नही पडना । मैंने उस मारकोस किनर (?) की बाबत मोस्कुआ और इस सरकार को न जाने कितनी बार लिखा है कि उस अमरीकन औरत के साथ अन्याय हुआ है । उसको जबरदस्ती आप लोगो ने इस देश से निकाला है । मेरी चिट्ठी का कोई असर नही पडा लेकिन फिर भी मैं तैयार था क्योकि स्वेतलाना रहती यहा पर और वह अपने माननीय सदस्य है बस्ती वाले, मैंने कहा था कि स्वेतलाना आकर मेरे घर मे रहे तो वह आकर क्यो नही रही क्योकि बेचारी स्टालिन की लड़की थी । स्टालिन चाहे जैसा आदमी रहा हो मेरी समझ मे अच्छा आदमी नही था, कुछ अच्छा था, कुछ बुरा था, मिश्रित था, शायद बुरा ज्यादा था, बुरा और अच्छा एक मिश्रित आदमी था, उसकी वह लड़की थी । आज जितने मामले उठ रहे हैं वह एक नही, हजारो लोग ऐसे हैं जो आज ससार मे असहाय और निरीह हैं जिनकी पूछताछ करने वाला कोई नही है । मैं चाहता हू कि उनका भी मामला उठे । उठाया भी है मैंने । लेकिन मुश्किल यह है कि यह स्टालिन की लडकी है इसलिये यह मामला इतना उठ गया है । क्या मुझे उन करोडो देशवासियो का पता नही है जो आज बिना खाय, करीब करीब मर चुके हैं या मर रहे हैं ? लेकिन सिर्फ वही आदमी वही सरकार इन करोडो लोगो की भूख से जो दिल की धडकन होती है उसे पहचान सकती है जो स्वेतलाना के दिल की धडकन को भी पहचाने । दोनो मिली जुली हैं, पेट की धडकन और मन की धडकन मिली जुली है ।

उधर से माननीय सदस्यो ने कई बार कहा जैसे कि हमने सदन का कोई वक्त खराब किया हो, नगान के बारे मे बहस करो, भूख के बारे म बहस करो । जानते हो अच्छ तरीके से कि भूख और अन्न और अन्न सहिता और कितना अनाज होना चाहिये उसके बारे मे इस सदन म जितनी बहस मैंने की है उतनी किसी ने नही की है लेकिन क्या असर पडा ? असर कही पडता नही है । इसलिये सीधा सा जवाब यह है कि एक तो असर पडेगा जनता के ऊपर जब वह आप लोगो को यहा से विदा करेगी और दूसरा असर यह पडेगा सत्य और असत्य पर । सत्य क्या है, असत्य क्या है ? मैं जानता हू बहुत घबडाये हुये हो, कई तरह की बातें कर रहे हो । जानते हो श्री दिनेश सिह ने, मैं कहना चाहता हू कि मुझ को न जाने कितनी बाते बताई अब क्या मैंने उनकी वह बाते यहा पर बताई ?

श्री दिनेश सिह मैंने भी क्या आप की बातें यहां पर कही ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : चलो दोनों एक जैसे हैं ।

फिर क्यों कहते हो कि मैं ज्यादा यहां पर राजनीतिक बात करता हूं। उस अंग्रेजी सरकार ने 10 दिन तक लगातार मुझ को लाहौर के किले में सोने नहीं दिया दिन रात तब भी उन्हें कोई बात नहीं मालूम हुई इसलिये आप बेफिक्र रहिये आप की कोई बात यहां नहीं मालूम होगी . . . .

श्री दिनेश सिंह : डा० साहब आप की भी कोई बात मेरे द्वारा मालूम नहीं होगी।

16 hrs.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं तारकेश्वरी जी को भी कहना चाहता हूं कि न जाने कितनी बातें वह मुझ को बतला जाती हैं लेकिन मैं ने क्या कभी उनको कहा है ? और उनको ही क्या न जाने कितने लोग और भी बैठे हुये हैं यहां, उन्होंने अब कई बातें मुझ से कही हैं लेकिन वह बातें मैं नहीं कहता। आप उन्हें सुन भी नहीं सकोगे। मेरे लिये यह सारा मामला बिलकुल ऐसा आ पड़ा है जो सारा वाक्या है

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : जो भी आप बताना चाहें बता दें मुझे उससे कोई खतरा नहीं है आप उसे कह सकते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं नहीं कहूंगा। नहीं कहूंगा तारकेश्वरी जी, जितना भी उकसाओगी मैं नहीं कहूंगा, नहीं तो फिर कहोगी कि तुम्हारी बातें बतला दीं। इसलिये एक बात बहुत जरूरी हो जाती है कि जब यहां पर इतनी बातें कह दी गईं, जो कुछ भी रूम में हुआ, तो मैं कह दूं कि मैं सचमुच रूस का दोस्त बनना चाहता हूं और हूं भी। चाहे वह कुछ भी समझते हों इस वक्त। मैं अमरीका का भी दोस्त बनना चाहता हूं। एक कार्य हम लोगों पर है, और मैं इस सदी के सब से क्रूर काम, यानी देशों के बटवारे को, खत्म कर के देशों को इकट्ठा करना चाहता हूं। भारत पाकिस्तान को बचाना चाहता हूं, दोनों का दोस्त बनना चाहता हूं। इसलिये जरूरी हो जाता है कि इस संबंध में जो कुछ रूस के साथ बातचीत हुई या खत-किताबत हुई, उसको इस सदन के पटल पर रक्खा जाये, स्वेतालाना का खत जो आया है वह भी सदन पटल पर रक्खा जाये। और सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि विशेषाधिकार समिति के पास जो प्रस्ताव जा रहा है, अगर उसको डा० राम सुभग सिंह . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : मरेंगे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अभी उन की उम्र बहुत ज्यादा नहीं हुई है, उनकी कुछ उम्र बाकी है, इसलिये मुझ से कुछ सबक सीखें। बहुत बुरे मरेंगे। इतना ही मुझे उनसे कहना है। इस बार तो किसी तरह बच गये, अगली बार नहीं बच पायेंगे।

विशेषाधिकार समिति के मामले में कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं है। अगर आप समझते हैं कि मेरे प्रस्ताव में . (व्यवधान) अगर व्यवधान हो और मैं उसे सुन लूं तब तो मैं उसका जवाब दूं।

श्री शिव नारायण : 400 वोटों से आये हो।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कोई मतलब की बात करो।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरी बातें तो सारी बेमतलब की होती हैं क्योंकि तुम को उखाड़ दिया करती हैं। आप के मतलब की नहीं है इसलिये बेमतलब हैं।

अगर उनको केवल एक शब्द से झगड़ा है कि मेरे प्रस्ताव में झांसा धोखे शब्द आया है, यानी चेहरा देखते ही साबित हो जावे, तो मैं अपनी तरफ से सुझाव दे रहा हूं, और शायद मसानी साहब को भी यह ज्यादा पसन्द आवे और उन को भी पसन्द आवे, कि मेरे प्रस्ताव में जो झांसा धोखे शब्द आया है

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

उसको हटा दिया जाये। उसको हटा कर जितना मामला हो वह सब विशेषाधिकार समिति को सौंप दिया जाये। विशेषाधिकार समिति के सामने मामला जायेगा तो पता चल जायेगा कि कौन सब बोल रहा है और कौन झूठ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से भी निवेदन करूंगा कि जरा थोड़ी देर के लिये आप मेरी तरफ देखें क्योंकि मैं थोड़ी सी अपील आप से करना चाहता हूं। अपनी नजर आप इधर रक्खें तो अच्छा होगा। यह चीज मामूली नहीं होगी। भारतवर्ष के इतिहास में यह लिखा रहेगा कि सत्य और असत्य के बीच की लकीर के बारे में इस सदन ने क्या किया। यहां सत्य के अंश को छिपाने वाली बात नहीं है। यहां मक्खियों की असंगत बातों की बात नहीं है, यहां सत्य और असत्य की बात है। पतली लकीर की बात नहीं है, बल्कि वह मोटी लकीर है जोकि सत्य को असत्य से अलग करती है। माननीय दिनेश सिंह जी कहते हैं कि स्वेतलाना ने कभी उन से यहां रहने के लिये नहीं कहा, मैंने साबित किया है कि उसने यहीं रहने के लिये कहा है। यह सीधी सी बात है। कोई पतली लकीर नहीं है, बड़ी मोटी लकीर है। इस मोटी लकीर के संबंध में आप सब लोगों से मेरा निवेदन है कि जरा इस तरफ अपने मत को दीजियेगा।

Shri M. R. Masani: Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion to the vote of the House, would you permit me to make an appeal to the movers of both the motions? I think something unfortunate would otherwise be happening. I appeal to Dr. Lohia and Dr Ram Subhag Singh to withdraw their respective motions. I would request the Minister of External Affairs to tell the House that if madame Svetlana wants asylum in India and says so, we shall grant it. I think it will be a happy end.

Shr M. C. Chagla: I have said this; I repeat it. If she applies for a visa . . .

Shri M. R. Masani: Asylum.

Shri M. C. Chagla: If she wants to stay permanently in our country, we will certainly favourably consider it. . (*Interruptions*).

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह देखिये, क्या कहते हैं। फ्रेवरेब्ली कंसिडरे कहते हैं।

Shri Nath Pai: Will you grant it or not?

Mr. Speaker: How can you force him to make a statement like that?

Shri Nath Pai: We should grant it.

Mr. Speaker: I shall put the motion to vote now Is there any proposal to withdraw it?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया . जी नहीं। अगर वह दे देते, उन को यहां आने देते, तो बात अलग थी। यह नहीं हो सकता। मैं अपना प्रस्ताव वापस नहीं लेता।

श्री मधु लिमये यह साफ कहें कि वह आ सकती है।

Mr. Speaker: They said that she could come here and they would be happy to give her asylum

श्री मधु लिमये प्रधान मंत्री कहें।

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, perhaps Mr. Chagla means to grant it but he himself knows that the reply he has given does not carry conviction because this is a stereotype reply which is in the printed letter: the matter is under sympathetic consideration. But it takes years and years. What he wants to say, let him say frankly, openly and

clearly: if she applies, certainly she will be entitled to come; we shall certainly grant it. Why do you hesitate? What are you afraid of, if you mean that?

Shri M. R. Masani: I think the answer is as good as an assurance and I appeal to both the movers to withdraw the motions. . . (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Shall I put the motion to the vote of the House? All right. The question is:

"It is the sense of the House that *prima facie*, there is a discrepancy between the repeated and categorical assertions of the Minister of External Affairs, on his own behalf and that of the Commerce Minister and the Government headed by the Prime Minister and the letters from Mrs. Svetlana to Dr. Lohia; and the House, therefore resolves to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee."

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : "डाक्टर" का शब्द हटा दीजिये। मेरे प्रस्ताव में वह शब्द नहीं है।

Mr. Speaker: Unfortunately it is in the printed motion; you may not have used it.

Those in favour of the motion may say: Aye.

Some hon. Members: The Ayes.

Mr. Speaker: Those against the motion may say: no.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Noes have it.

Some Hon. Members: The Ayes have it.

Mr. Speaker: They want a division. Let the Lobbies be cleared.

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 3] AYES [16.11 hrs.

Abraham, Shri K. M.
Adichan, Shri P. C.
Ahmed, Shri J.
Amat, Shri D.
Amin, Prof. R. K.
Amin, Shri Ramchandra
Amersey, Shri M.
Anbuchezhian, Shri
Anirudhan, Shri K.
Atam Das, Shri
Agarwal, Shri Ram Singh.
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Behera, Shri Baidhar
Bhadoria, Shri Arjun Singh.
Bharat Singh Shri
Bharti, Shri Maharaj Singh
Birua, Shri Kolai
Biswas, Shri J. M.
Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
Bhagaban Das, Shri
Chakrapani, Shri C. K.
Chandra Shekhar, Singh Shri
Chatterjee, Shri H. P.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Chittyhabu, Shri C.
Chowdhury Shri B. K. Das
Dandekar, Shri N.
Dar, Abdul Gani
Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
Deo, Shri P. K.
Desai, Shri C C.
Devgun, Shri Hardayal
Dhandapani, Shri
Dhirendranath, Shri
Dipa, Shri A.
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Esthose, Shri P. P.
Fernandes, Shri George
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri Ganesh
Girraj Saran Singh, Shri
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Gopalan, Shri P.
Gopalan, Shrimati Suseela
Gowd, Shri Gadilingana
Gowder, Shri Nanja
Gupta, Shri Kanwarlal
Jageshwar, Shri
Jai Bahadur Singh, Shri
Jena, Shri D. D.
Jha, Shri Bhogendra
Jha, Shri S. C.
Joshi Shri Jaganath Rao
Joshi, Shri S. M.
Kabir, Shri Humayun
Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
Kalita, Shri Dhiveshwar
Kameshwar Singh, Shri
Kandappan, Shri S.
Kaushik, Shri K. M.
Kedar Paswan, Shri
Khan, Shri Ajmal
Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali
Khan, Shri Latafat Ali
Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
Kisku, Shri A. K.
Kothari, Shri S. S.
Krishnamoorthi, Shri V.
Krishnan, Shri G. Y
Kundu, Shri S.
Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
Kushwah, Shri Y. S.
Lakkappa, Shri K.
Limaye Shri Madhu
Lohia, Dr. Ram Manohar
Madhok, Shri Bal Raj
Madhuka, Shri K. M.
Majhi, Shri M.
Mangalathumadom, Shri
Masani, Shri M. R.
Meetha Lal, Shri
Meghachandra, Shri M.
Menon, Shri V. V.
Misra, Shri Srinibas
Modak, Shri B. K.
Mody, Shri Piloo
Mohamed Imam, Shri
Mohammad Ismail, Shri

Mohan Swarup, Shri
Molahu, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Muthusami Shri C.
Naik, Shri G. C.
Naik, Shri R. V.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Nambiar, Shri
Nath Pai, Shri
Nayar, Shrimati Shailabala
Nihal, Shri
Padanatha, Shri Muhammed S.
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
Parmar, Shri D. R.
Patel, Shri J H.
Patil, Shri N R.
Rai, Shri Charanjit
Rajaram, Shri
Ram Charan, Shri
Ram Gopal, Shri
Ramamurti, Shri P.
Ramani, Shri K.
Ramji Ram, Shri
Rasu, Shri Durai
Ray, Shri Rabi
Sambandhan, Shri S. K
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Sambhali, Shri Ishaq
Saminathan, Shri
Santosham, Dr. M.
Satya Narain Singh, Shri
Sen, Shri Deven
Shah, Shri Virenendra Kumar J.
Sharda Nand, Shri
Sharma, Shri B. S
Sharma, Shri N S.
Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt
Shastri, Shri R.
Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh
Shastry, Shri Sheopujan
Shiv Charan Lal, Shri
Shivappa, Shri N.
Singh, Shri J. B.
Solanki, Shri P. N.
Somani, Shri N. K.
Sondhi, Shri M. L.
Sreedharan, Shri A.
Subravelu, Shri
Suraj Bhan, Shri
Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
Thakur, Shri Gunanand
Tyagi, Shri O. P.
Umanath, Shri
Vajpayee, Shri A. B
Vidyarthi, Shri R. S.
Viswanathan, Shri G.
Yadav, Shri Sewak

NOES

Achal Singh, Shri
Agadi, Shri S. A.
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Aga, Shri Ahmad
Ahmad, Dr. I.
Ahmed, Shri P. A.
Anjanappa, Shri B
Ankineedu, Shri
Arumugam Shri R S.
Asgar Husain, Shri
Avdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh, Shri
Bajaj Shri Kamalnayan
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Barua, Shri R
Barupal Shri P. L.
Baswant Shri
Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
Besra, Shri S C
Bhagat Shri B R.
Bhargavati Shri
Bhakt Darshan Shri
Bhandare, Shri R. D
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
Bhargava Shri B N
Bhattacharyya Shri C K
Bhola Nath Shri
Birla Shri B K
Bist Shri J B. S
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Buta Singh Shri
Chanda Shri Anil K
Chanda Shrimati Ivotsna
Chandrika Prasad Shri
Chatterji Shri Krishna Kumar
Chaturvedi Shri R L.
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chavan Shri D B
Chavan, Shri Y. B.
Choudhury, Shri J. K.
Choudhury, Shri Valmiki
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Damani, Shri S R
Das Shri N. T.
Dass, Shri C.
Deoghare, Shri N. R.
Desai, Shri Morarji
Deshmukh, Shri B D
Deshmukh, Shri K G.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
Devinder Singh, Shri
Dhillon, Shri G. S.
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
Digvijai Nath, Mahant
Dinesh Singh Shri
Dixit Shri G C
Ering Shri D.
Gairai Singh Rao, Shri
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K R
Ganga Devi Shrimati
Gannat Sahai Shri
Gautam Shri C D.
Gavit, Shri Tukaram
Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti
Ghosh, Shri P. K.
Ghosh, Shri Parimal
Giria Kumari Shrimati
Govind Das Dr
Gowda, Shri M. H
Gupta Shri Lakhanlal
Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
Hafiarnawis Shri
Hanumanthaiya Shri
Hari Krishna, Shri
Hazarika, Shri J. N
Hem Raj, Shri
Hitmatsingka, Shri
Hiri Shri
Ishal Singh Shri
Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
Jadhav Shri V N
Jagannath Shri K
Jagjiwan Ram, Shri
Jamir, Shri S C.
Kahandole, Shri
Kamble, Shri
Kamla, Kumari Shrimati
Kastur, Shri A S.
Katham, Shri B. N.
Kavade, Shri B R
Kedaria, Shri C M
Keshri, Shri Sitaram
Khan, Shri M.A.
Khanna Shri P K
Kikar Singh, Shri
Kinder Lal, Shri
Kirat Shri Manikya
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Krishnan Shri G Y
Kureel, Shri B N
Kushok Bakula, Shri
Lakshmikantamma, Shrimati
Lilit Sen Shri
Laskar, Shri N R
Laxmi Rai, Shrimati
Lutfal Haque, Shri
Lutfal Haque Shri
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr
Maharaj Singh, Shri
Mahinda, Shri Narendra Singh
Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
Malimarivappa, Shri
Mandal Shri Yamuna Prasad
Mane, Shri Shankarao
Marandi, Shri
Masuria Din, Shri
Mehta, Shri Asoka
Melkote, Dr
Menon Shri Govinda
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra Shri G. S.
Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
Mohsin, Shri
Mondal, Shri J. K.
Mondal, Dr. P.
Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri

Mudrika Singh, Shri
Mukherjee, Shrimati Sharda
Murthi, Shri B. S.
Murti, Shri M. S.
Nageshwar, Shri
Naghnoor, Shri M. N.
Nahata, Shri Amrit
Naidu, Shri Chengalrava
*Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
Nanda, Shri
Nayar, Dr. Sushila
Nirlep Kaur, Shrimati
Oraon, Shri Kartik
Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
Pahadia, Shri
Pandey, Shri K. N.
Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
Pandit, Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
Pant, Shri K. C.
Paoki Naokip, Shri
Parmer, Shri Bhalibhai
Partap Singh, Shri
Parthasarathy, Shri
Patel, Shri Manibhai J.
Patel, Shri Manubhai
Patel, Shri N. N.
Patel, Shri A. V.
Patil, Shri C. A.
Patil, Shri Deorao
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patil, Shri S. D.
Patil, Shri T. A.
Poonacha, Shri C. M.
Pradhari, Shri K.
Pramanik, Shri J. N.
Qureshi, Shri Shaffi
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
Radhabhai, Shrimati, B. K.
Raj Deo Singh, Shri
Rajaseknaran, Shri
Raju, Shri D. B.
Ram Dhani Das, Shri
Ram Kishan, Shri
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
Ram, Shri T.
Ram Dhan, Shri
Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramesh Chandra, Shri
Rampur, Manadevapa.
Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Rana, Shri M. B.
Randhir Singh, Shri
Rane, Shri
Rao, Shri Jaganath
Rao, Dr. K. L.
Rao, Shri K. Narayana
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, Shri Thirumala
Raut, Shri Bhola
Reddi, Shri G. S.
Reddy, Shri Ganga
Reddy, Shri P. Antony
Reddy, Shri R. D.
Rohatgi, Shrimati Sushila
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Roy, Shrimati Uma
Sadhu Ram, Shri
Saha, Shri S. K.
Saleem, Shri M. Y.
Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Sanghi, Shri N. K.
Sanji Rupji, Shri
Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Sant Bux Singh, Shri
Sarma, Shri A. T. (Bhanjanagar)
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
Sayyad Ali, Shri
Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
Sen, Shri P. G.
Sethi Shri P. C.
Sethuramae, Shri N.
Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
Shah, Shri Manabendra
Shah, Shri Shantilal
Shambhu Nath, Shri
Shankaranand, Shri
Sharma, Shri Shiv
Shastri, Shri B. N.
Shastri, Shri Shiv Kumar
Sheo Narain, Shri
Sher Singh, Prof.
Sheth, Shri T. M.
Shinkre, Shri
Shinde, Shri Annasahib
Shiv Chandika, Shri
Shukla, Shri S. N.
Siddayya, Shri
Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
Singh, Shri D. N.
Singh, Shri D. V.
Sinha, Shri R. K.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
Sinlak, Shri Nar Deo
Solanki, Shri S. M.
Sonar, Dr. A. G.
Sonavane, Shri
Sunder Lal, Shri
Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Suryanarayana, Shri K.
Swamy, Shri G. Venkat
Swaran Singh, Shri
Swell, Shri
Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tripathi, Shri K. D.
Tulsidas, Shri
Uikey, Shri M. G.
Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri Prem Chand
Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet, Shri

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. All of you might please sit down. Those who have made mistakes, if any, one by one may get up and say.

With the additons that have been made—of course, they have checked up to the extent possible—the result of the division is as follows:

** †

Ayes—150; Noes—236

Therefore, the Noes have it.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put Dr. Ram Subhag Singh's motion to vote.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, the notice becomes infructuous (*Interruption*).

---

*Shri N. Sreekantan Nair Recorded his vote hnder 'Noes thougn he actualy wanted to vote for 'Ayes'.

**Names of three Members could not be recorded.

†Name of one Member could not be recorded.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that the Minister of External Affairs, Minister of Commerce and the Prime Minister have not committed any breach of privilege of the House with regard to the complaint of privilege brought before the House by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia today.".

The motion was adopted.

16.22 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

TELEGRAPH (AMENDMENT) RULES

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Indian Telegraph (Second Amendment) Rules, 1967 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 312 in Gazette of India dated the 11th March, 1967, under sub-section (5) of section 7 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-227/67.]

REPORT OF NATIONAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the National Research Development Corporation of India, New Delhi, for the year 1965-66 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-228/67.]

REPORT OF HINDUSTAN TELEPRINTERS LTD.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Anual Report of the Hindustan Teleprinters Limited, Madras, for the year 1965-66 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-229/67].

CONCLUSIONS OF INDUSTRIAL COMMITTEE ON COAL MINING, ETC.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) A copy of the Main Conclusion of the Tenth Session of the Industrial Committee on Coal Mining held at Dhanbad on the 30th January, 1967. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-230/67.]

(2) A copy of the Neyveli Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1771 in Gazette of India dated the 26th November, 1966, under section 7A of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Bonus Schemes Act, 1948. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-231/67.]

(3) A copy of the Dock Workers (Advisory Committee) Amendment Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. S.O. 803 in Gazette of India dated the 11th March, 1967, under sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-232/67.]

FOREST SERVICE (RECRUITMENT) AMENDMENT RULES

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri K. S. Ramaswamy): I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) A copy of the Indian Forest Service (Recruitment) Amendment Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 387 in Gazette of India dated the 25th March, 1967, under sub-section (2) of section 3 of the All India Services Act, 1951. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-233/67.]

(2) A copy of the Policy-Forces (Restriction of Rights) Rules, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1662 in Gazette of India dated the 15th De-

cember, 1966, under sub-section (2) of section 6 of the Police Forces (Restriction of Rights) Act, 1966. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-234/67.]

REPORT OF SALAR JUNG MUSEUM BOARD ETC.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Education (Prof. Sher Singh): I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) A copy of the Annual Report of the Salar Jung Museum Board, Hyderabad for the year 1965-66, along with the Audited Accounts. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-235/67.]

(2) A copy of the Salar Jung Museum (Amendment) Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 341 in Gazette of India dated the 11th March, 1967, under sub-section (3) of section 27 of the Salar Jung Museum Act, 1961. [*Placed in the Library. See* No LT-236/67.]

(3) A copy of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Amendment) Rules, 1966, published in Notification No. S. O. 3520 in Gazette of India dated the 20th November, 1966, under sub-section (4) of section 38 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-237/67.]

(4) (i) A copy each of the Annual Reports of the Executive Committee of the Trustees of the Victoria Memorial, Calcutta, for the years 1963-64 and 1964-65. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-185/67].

(ii) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the above Reports.

(5) A copy of the Annual Report the Executive Committee of the Trustees of the Victoria Memorial Calcutta, for the year 1965-66. [*Placed in the Library See* No. LT-238/67].

16.24 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—*Contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri K. Hanumanthaiya and seconded by Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey on the 21st March 1967, namely:—

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:—

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 18th March, 1967."

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Parliament has met after three crucial months during wdhich tho political scene in India is transformed. This is a phenomenon which proves the vitality of our contry, the vitality of our democratic system and the faith of our people in our system.

Life is always changing. It is not only the Congress but even the hon. Members opposite who must adjust to those changes. As I said on a previous occason here, now all of us, the Congress and the other parties, are in Government and outside Government. We see here many new faces and I had hoped that new ideas would also emerge. But listening to the debate—I would like to assure hon. Members that even though I was not present here all the time I did listen to almost all the speeches from my room—I was disappointed. I thought new ideas would emerge, ideas which would help to strengthen our democracy and our country. But I did not see much evidence of this. I do not grudge my hon.

[Shrimati Indra Gandhi]

friends opposite their sense of elation or pleasure at the success they have gained in some States. I welcome the fact that they now share not only power but also the responsibility that goes with power. I am not much concerned with which party sits on which side in what State. What is important is that whichever side is in power uses the opportunity to solve the problems which confront our country. Along with this positive aspect, chang brings with it fresh challenges, also certain dangers against which we have to guard. Here and there there are evidences of small groups belonging to different sides, this side as well as the other side, who have tried to place themselves in a position to bargain. There are some who are attracted to politics today when politics means an opportunity for power, and they are using this opportunity to criticise those who joined politics at a time when it meant unmitigated hardship. I am referreing to the many members of the Congress, some of whom are now in the House and a very large number outside, who have sacrificed a great deal from their youth throughout and life to old age for the Congress, not merely because Congress is a party but because the Congress stood for certain vital values in the country.... p

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Only in the Congress?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: All of you were also in the Congress. I am not denying that. But that does not mean that you should now consider that everything that is in the Congress is bad and that you should not recognise the very genuine sacrifices which so many genuine and sincere and dedicated workers have made to the cause of freedom and the cause of building the country after freedom.

The most important question which we face today is the question of food and of drought in certain parts of the country. The other day, yesterday I think, certain members referred to my visit to Bihar and U.P. Therefore, I would like to say a few words on this matter. I have been to Palamau, Gaya and Mirzapur over the last week end. Never have I seen the Gangetic plains so dry. The recent rains gave a little relief in the sense that they have helped some grass to grow, reducing the shortage of fodder and also delaying the crisis about the availability of drinking water. But this is a crisis that has only been postponed and we will have to face it within a short time.

I found that a great deal of work was being done. But I also found the need to accelerate this work and to extend it and expand it in every way. The Centre will do all it can to supply needed equipment and store. We are also making an effort to enlist the support of all possible people who can help in this. A suggestion was made, which I welcome, that ex-servicemen living in those areas might help in some of these problems. distinguish. In the face of such acute

Unfortunately, there was a set back to relief work due to the elections. Now we have to regain the momentum again. The State Governments are doing the job and non-official agencies are also active, specially in Bihar. I would like to pay a tribute here to the Bihar Relief Committee, of which Shri Jayajrakash Narayan is the Chairman. He has gathered together a band of workers who are doing excellent work. The special complication in Bihar is that of the outbreak of smallpox.

In Palamau District I heard that 2 lakhs are at work out of a total of 2 lakhs of the working population, but more help is needed from non-official agencies because the coming three summer months will be exceedingly critical.

In Mirzapur I found a large number of aged and destitute and, as hon. Members may have read in the newspapers, I was given some reports of starvation deaths. I, naturally, took up this matter with the authorities. I was given two representations, one giving specific names, a list of 13, of which the authorities have already in-

vestigated 11 names and they have various causes for death. The other representation mentioned the figure 50 but gave no details of the names or where these people came from. Naturally, unless we have more detailed information, it is difficult to look into this.

This question of stravation deaths was also taken up by the hon. Members here. What I would like to say is whether deaths are due to stravation or ailments or diseases which come about because of prolonged malnutrition and exposure, it is really hard to distreas this would be a verbal dispute. The need of the hour is to provide all the relief that is necessary and all that is possible whether Government provides it or non-offici agencies or the people themselves.

The foodgrains supply is in shortage all over the country and we cannot meet the full demand of all the States. The Food Minister and I have had talks with the Chief Ministers of Kerala and Bihar. We will discuss this matter in greater detail at the proposed Chief Ministers' Conference this week-end.

I feel, as I have said earlier also, there is need for a national sharing of the distress, the need to mobilise all our energies and all our resources, to cut our lavishness and waste. This is something which we can only do with the full co-operation of the States. It is something which we must sit down and discuss and formulate a plan which can be carried out and implemented in all parts of the country.

Some have said that we would rathere starve than import food. I am afraid, I cannot agree with this and I feel that it is an irresponsible statement to make in the present conditions.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): We are importing and starvaing, both.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi): It is because we cannot import as much as is needed; but it is a problem which faces the entire country and it is, as some hon. Members said, a national problem.

When I talked of co-operation with hon. Members outside, it is not on small matters of procedure and thing like that—they are important and if we can work together, it is a good thing—but far more important is to get co-operation in these matters which are matters of national importance and of life and death for our people. Certainly, food comes in that category.

Food and drought relief are the foremost problems for us. Last year we faced the same kind of problem and it was only through a Herculean effort that we were able to avert a great human tragedy. This year is even more difficult because reserves are depleted and there is considerable uncertainty about supplies which we can get and which we need.

The Food Minister has already outlined the programme of short-term crops and we must all see that this programme is made a success. There is also the need to accelerate intensive cultivation programmes all over the country. Many steps are being taken to deal with this immediate problem in Bihar and in eastern U.P. Some people here mentioned Rajasthan. I would like to say that we have not at all forgotten that Rajasthan also faces this problem and so do areas of other States.

16.35 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

There was the joint Emergency Committee for Bihar set up under the Food Minister with the Bihar Chief Minister and his colleagues. In the short time, it has already met three times.

There are some figures which I would like to give to the hon. Members. I am told that nearly 6·5 lakhs people are employed on relief works or on Plan schemes in Bihar and the number may increase to 15 lakhs in the months of maximum distress which are May and June. Over 3.5 lakhs people have been give gratuitous relief from the State plus

[Shrimati Indra Gandhi]

2.6 lakhs who are fed in free kitchens run by non-official agencies, that is, the Ramakrishna Mission, the Warwari Relief Society and other agencies. The international agencies like the CARE and the UNICEF are giving milk to 14.6 lakh people. We also received a gift of 40,000 tons from Italy which is valued at about Rs. 60 lakhs to Rs. 70 lakhs and this has also been used for giving relief through voluntary agencies.

Drinking water is an acute problem and schemes worth over Rs. 5 crores have been sanctioned by the Central Government.

118 rigs are being mobilised from all available resources, our own as well as abroad, by the Government, the Army and the private agencies and so on. About 66 rigs are working and another 33 rigs have reached the sites. Institutions like the Geological Survey of India, the Oil and Natural Gas Commission, the UNICEF and so on are helping in this and also the Governments of U.K. and Canada have offered to airlift the rigs. We are also airlifting other essential things. In cattle camps, half a million heads of cattle have been provided and there are short-term fodder crop plans for 130,000 acres. The food supply to Bihar is being progressively increased from 72,000 tons in last October to 1,85,000 tons in April this year. Over Rs. 50 lakhs have been given from the Drought Relief Fund to U.P. and Bihar. Health measures are also being taken but I must confess that these need to be stepped up considerably.

Sir, the elections have thrown up certain political challenges. But the real challenge is, and it remains, the economic challenge of prices and production. Many hon. Members opposite have talked about the economic situation. This is natural because it is a serious one. But, as usual, the diagnosis as well as the treatment has differed from person to person. This is what I mean to say, when I say that we should get together on certain things. Let us have some kind of a minimum programme at least on which we can agree, just on one or two national issues.

The hon. Member, Mr. Masani, painted a gloomy picture. Mr. Hiren Mukerjee said that devaluatin was at the root of all ills. Others questioned the food policy and so on. The main cause really is fall in production, mainly the fall in agricultural production. Shri Morarjibhai has given the blunt facts. We are not making any attempt to cover up anything or to hide anything. We have put all the difficulties and the seriousness of the situation very clearly before the House. We must now do everything possible to increase production and to cut existing expenditure to the bone.

Higher production and budgetary discipline can give some respite from high prices. I think, that streamlining the administration and procedures is the first need and the second is to use the full capacity of already installed plants, and to have a full survey of their capacities. It is necessary that we try to achieve our target of swadeshi in the next 10 years.

We are very anxious that conditions should be created in which science and technology can be applied to practial problems of the nation, the economic development as well as the security of the nation. Therefore, it is necessary to have a greater interflow between institutions of research and development and those connected with implementation of programmes and also to have a larger measure of technical, scientifi and technocratic association at appropriate levels of policy-making and implementation, so that a climate can be created for the most effective fulfilment of tasks according to modern methods of technology and science

In administration also, the changed situation needs changed methods and change in outlook also. We are trying to give greater autonomy to public sector plants and to simplify financial procedure so as to reduce delays which are costly and which have

prevented so many of our schemes from getting going.

We have policy planning cells which can at all stages look forward and see how the present programme fit into the programmes for the future.

Many speakers have talked about the public sector. Those whose creeds disapprove of the public sector as a whole, naturally saw nothing but failure about them. I am not prepared to admit that failure. There have certainly been shortcomings, but there has been good work also. I do agree that the public sector must be run well and must produce results, must create new resources, and that we should try our utmost to give new re-orientation to the public sector which would increase its efficiency and all round, profitability, modernise management consolidate their investments and make efficiency their watchward.

Much interest was evinced in the future of the Planning Commission. The Administrative Reforms Commission has received its interim report from the Study Team and I suppose, we will get their recommendations in a short time. Therefore, I do not want to anticipate what they are going to say. But I am sorry that the Planning Commission should have come in for so much criticism. It has played a valuable, even a historic, role. It has translated the economic vision of our nation-builders into concrete policies and it has provided a useful forum for discussions between States and the Centre. It would have been very difficult for the Government to achieve this without the Planning Commission. The objective expert composition of the Planning Commission has naturally helped. I have felt that the Commission should concentrate much more on the task of economic development, i.e., analysing factors and trends, assessing strategy and, if possible, it should present various alternatives. That is, it should be a kind of an expert body which would give certain alternatives, which would Of course, the task of actual implementation falls on the State Governments.

Another criticism made here of the Planning Commission was that it was encroaching on the States. But the major decisions on the Plan, the size, strategy, priorities and allocations, are always taken by the National Development Council which consists of both Central and State representatives and even in the old days, despite the fact that there was the same party in power in the States, there were pulls and counter-pulls; there were occasions when States' interests were not always satisfied according to the desire of the State representatives and there was some clash with the Centre This will no doubt, continue. I sincerely hope that this will not be taken to mean that the Centre is not co-operating with the States, but only that the State problem has to be viewed in the context of the national problem. All of us have to adjust our programmes in that light and in that perspective.

Fedralism means that Government functioning is shared by and divided among different focil of authority.

With the changes which have come about in the recent elections, the NDC naturally assumes greater importance. All the schemes which we take up are national schemes, whether they are in the State sector or the Central sector, because the welfare and progress of the country are indivisible.

Many hon Members have talked of Centre-State relationship. Certain Chief Ministers have also come out with statements on this matter. I read the other day the Address of the Governor of Madras. I think there need be no aprehension of friction. The Constitution is strong enough and also resilient enough. The problem of Centre-State relations is an old problem in our national movement. I think the Constitution was drawn up with foresight and its spirit is both accommodating and reconciliatory. It

[Shrimati Indra Gandhi]

spells out division of functions to the extent possible and leaves the rest to discussion.

Now, even in these three weeks of the new Government, I am heartened at the kind of response which we have had from the State Governments. I would like to declare once more that our own attitude will always be to work together with them in the national interest.

Even if a subject is in the State list, such as Agriculture or Education, inter State and Centre State interdependence are unavoidable.

Shri A. K. Gopalan spoke of provincial autonomy. I would like him to appreciate more fully the spirit of our Constitution, and I would like him to look once again at the statement made by the Chief Minister of Kerala who said that time must be given for these relations to develop.

Shri A. K. Gopalan wanted a higher share of income-tax and export earnings. Under the Constitution, as you all know, a Finance Commission goes into this matter every five years. As for grants, the Study Team of the Administrative Reforms Commission is going into the question of Centre-State finance.

Many hon. Members referred to the problem of corruption. We are as anxious as anybody to maintain the highest standards of personal integrity because we think that this is essential in public life. The Administrative Reforms Commisson has recommended the institution o a Lokpal and a Lok Ayukt. We have nearly completed formulating our views, and we have approached the States. We would like to have their views also before finalising our own.

A matter which creates great emotion is that of language Many Members have spoken on this matter, Shri V. Krishnamoorthi talked of the betraval of non-Hindi-speaking people. Shri H. N. Mukerjee talked of the need for imaginative handling. I think that a very good reply to this was given by Shritmati Tarkeshwari Sinha who very clearly said that we had no desire to impose Hindi on the South. Friends of the DK have spoken with deep passion on this matter. Our view is well known. We believe that all our languages are national languages and of equal status. And any of them can be made the official language, if a State so wants. But it is important also for all of us to be able to understand each other and this was the real reason why we felt that one language should be a national link language. We have given a solemn assurance that English will be retained at the Centre as an associate link language as long as tris is deemed necessary. We shall move a Bill in the next session to give formal effect to this assurance.

I should like to make a reference also to Urdu I am very concerned with this problem. When certain deputations came to see me earlier, we assured them that this matter would be taken up most urgently. Here again, in some States there are new governments. We will take up this matter when the Chief Ministers come here, and I hope that it will be satisfactorily solved.

Reference was made to the delay in announcing Government's decision regarding the Education Commission's Report. The Education Minister himself was a member of this Commission. I am sure he will set a definite date by which to announce his decision. He is also setting up a Youth Division in the Education Ministry.

A new Member spoke about the President's powers. Our Constitution is clear on this issue. Our conventions are well-established. I do not think there is any justification for imaginary fears of friction.

I should like to say one more word here about our deep concern about some sections in our country who have been under-privileged and who,

in spite of various programmes have not really had their due share. I am speaking now of our Harijan brothers and sisters, of our tribal brothers and sisters, of our hill people and of the very large mass of people who are known as the landless labour. These people have really had the worst of the difficult situation and we must bend all our energies to help them now in every way.

I should like to say a few words about foreign affairs and our relations with foreign countries, whether they be our neighbours or whether they are situated far off. Many members have touched upon this. The hon. member, Shri Masani, said that we are friendless. I think it is very difficult to judge who is whose friend I do not think that we are friendless. In times of need, countries with different systems, different persuasions, have come to our help; I think the list of our friends, if we are to go into detail, is a fairly comprehensive one and it covers practically all continents.

Our foreign relations are governed only by considerations of national interest and the nation's security and are rooted in the firm belief that mankind is one family and that to exist we have also to co-exist. That is why we have tried always to further our national interests from the economic, political and strategic points of view and secondly to promote international co-operation and peace. This was our aim in the past and this is what will guide us in the future.

I want to assure members about one thing. Some of them have a feeling that we pursue a particular policy merely because it has been a declared policy. All policies are constantly under review, because if they do not serve the purpose of today, there is naturally no point in continuing with the same policies. If we continue a particular policy today, it is because on reviewing and re-testing, we feel that it meets the needs of today, that it meets the needs of national interests.

We also have a fundamental dedication to championing the cause of all people who are fighting against racialism and colonialism. Some people feel that may be this is unnecessary or it is not our business, but we know from our own experience how much it meant to us when we were fighting for our freedom when there were people in other countries who appreciated our fight, and if they could not help us in any other way at least they could give moral support. Freedom is indivisible. Therefore, we are deeply concerned with the rights of the people of South Africa, of Angla, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea, Southern Rhodesia, Aden and other countries which have yet to attain freedom.

Shri M. R. Masani: What about Tibet?

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): Pathans. What about Pakhtunistan?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: There are few things which are more dangerous than the consequences of racial war, and that is why we have opposed the policy followed in South Africa.

Some members have talked of the need for a more positive policy towards Pakistan. Government entirely agree. We have always stated our point that it is necessary, in fact it is vital, for India and Pakitan to work in co-operation on as many issues and as many spheres as possible, because we are neighbours, because we share the same problems and difficulties. And we shall certainly continue to make every effort possible to have greater understanding and goodwill with Pakistan. It distresses us deeply that our relationship should not have been one of amity, and that there should be considerable distrust between these two neighbours.

With regard to China, our policy is well known, and here again, we have no quarrel with the Chinese

[Shrimati Indra Gandhi]

people, and we would certainly like not to have a rigid attitude in this, but we feel that some indication should come or some situation created in which we can get out of our present rut. This has been completely lacking, but we do not believe that we should close the door or that matter.

Prof. Mukerjee said that we have been silent on Vietnam. There are other members who are constantly telling us that we talk too much about Vietnam. Sir, actually, I do not think we are silent, nor have we overstated the case. We have expressed our view whenever it was necessary to do so The House knows the Government's views on this We fervently hope that peace will return to Vietnam soon. We have welcomed the various peace moves which have been made, including the one by the Secretary-General, U Thant, whom we shall have the pleasure of welcoming amidst us some time next week. And it is our hope that the problem can be taken away from the battle field and brought to the conference table.

I also want to talk about something which is rather delicate. For some time now, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, systematic attempts have been made in this House by certain quarters to raise questions in one form of another about gifts received by me especially from foreign dignitaries, or about my personal possessions. I have denied these allegations on the floor of the House, and I want to do so again. Since I become a Member of Parliament or entered Government, or earlier when I was a private citizen, I should say that, to the best of my knowledge, I did not infringe any of our conventions and rules relating to the acceptance of such gifts The allegations and insinuations which have been sought to be raised are false and malicious. I have denied the specific allegations from time to time.

Mention was recently made about a diamond necklace given to me over ten years ago by the King of Saudi Arabia, and I have written to the Speaker at some length about this I am not really worried about these allegations even though they are made day in and day out. But there is a deliberate and sustained attempt at character assassination and it is for this House to judge and decide how long this personal villification and maligning can be allowed to continue

17 hrs.

I would like to take this opportunity to make a few other observations on this matter. In 1955, the then Prime Minister, my father, expressed the view that it would be desirable to apply the to shakana rules to Ministers also and that they should not retain expensive presents He went on to observe that as the toshakanas was not equipped properly to preserve the many things which were given they should be sent to museums and other suitable places where they might remain as state property, rather than as the personal property of the recipient That is how he and I treated the presents which we received Except for a stol of sable skin which was presented to me by Mr Khrushchev on the Russian trip, I have not retained any other expensive gifts I kept this gift because in the manner in which it was given, it was felt that it would perhaps be misunderstood if it were handed over. It is not the custom to make public the details about the presents received from Heads of States and Governments or other high dignitaries from friendly foreign countries. They vary considerably in nature and any publication of a list of presents, such as might possibly give rise to embarrassing comparisons between country and country, would obviously not be in keeping with the propriety and the dig-

nity of our relations with those countries. It would also not be in the public interest to reveal how individual presents were disposed of because such disclosures might conceivably be misunderstood as an act of discourtesy to the dignitaries from whom they were received. But a full list of all these things is however kept.

Under the code of conduct which was adopted sometime ago and which was laid before Parliament, all Union Ministers send returns of their personal assets and liabilities to the Prime Minister. Although the code does not specifically lay down any procedure for the Prime Minister, for my part I have been following the practice of placing my own statement along with the records of my colleagues.

There is no intention on my part nor on the part of my colleagues to evade answering allegations even of a personal character which any Member might choose to level. We have rules and conventions about the manner in which such allegations can be raised by one Member against another, whether in Government or not. These rules and conventions naturally take into account the fact that what any of us chooses to say on the floor of this House is fully protected against legal consequences and highly privileged. I think it is within the right of this House and indeed appropriate, that it should be possible to raise allegations against Members of Government or even against another Member which relate to the period of Membership of the House or of Government. It would be particularly open to a Member to raise such allegations against a minister of a nature which involves abuse of public office.

I say all this with a sense of hesitation because from time to time various things have been said which concern me personally and I consider it my duty to bring them up here today. I sincerely feel that what this House must consider are some of the general issues that arise, including, if I may say so, in all humility, the question of how long one single Member or two should be allowed to persist with wild, irresponsible and baseless allegations against the Prime Minister of the country.

When I began to speak, I spoke about certain national problems. Some hon. Members opposite tend to give the impression that it is only they who are concerned with the poverty in the country or with the difficulties in the country, Indeed, it is not so. In speaking of these, they do not speak only of the present period of difficulties or the last year or two.

But they try to sweep up all the 20 years since Independence years in which considerable progress was made years in which the very face of this nation has been transformed.

An hon. Members: Question.

Shrimati Inddira Gandhi: Well, I think this is there for all to see. Except in the tribal parts and the drought-affected areas, there is great differences from before in the lives of our peasantry, in the lives of our workers and so on. But it is true that since the last few years and notably since 1962, since the Chinese invasion followed by other repeated invasions, along with which we had this unprecedented drought, Hon. Memobrs may know that at least in Uttar Pradesh, it is really three years since we have had hardly any rain, and even in the year before, that is, the fourth year, rainfall was deficient. So, a very difficult situation has arisen because of this, and at the same time, we have had a rise in population and rising demands from our people.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Rising prices also.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Well, that is true. There are many causes for it. As I repea tedly said, we are not trying to hide anything; we do not

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

want to run away from the shortcomings of the Government. They are there; there have been short-comings in implementation; we all know there have been, but it does not help to keep on underlining the shortcomings and ignoring the achievments. All that I say is, let us see the picture in its reality; it is not that the situation is not grim today. The statements made by the Deputy Prime Minister and the Food Minister have very clearly outlined how critical and grim the situation is, and what a termendous national effort will be needed in order to face it and to overcome it. Therefore, we must all get together to create the national will to face this kind of problem. (*Interruption*). As I said, we are not running away from the fact that we might have made mistakes, but the situation is also caused by many, many happenings and events which were beyond our control, such as the invasion on our borders, the increase in defence expenditure, which naturally had to follow, and other problems which I have already mentioned.

National problems require a national outlook, and a national effort. Many honurable Members opposit feel that they have suggested a national government. But if we cannot even get together on these problems and form a basis of working on policy, I do not see how a national government can function in the present cirumstances. It is for Honourable Members opposite and all the different parties to show that they are willing to tackle these problems on a national basis.....

Shri Kanwarlal Gupta: (Delhi: Sadar): The initiative should come from you.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: .... and to find at least what is the minimum common factor which could straightway be implemented and pursuade. Our primarytask is that of economic growth and of the rapid transformation of our economy. And it is a trenmendous task to transform this great and ancient country in keeping with the hopes of the new generation. We are deeply concerned with the difficulties of the masses of our people and the question of inequality. This question has come up and rightly, many times in this House and it is a question to which we must give deep thought and try to solve. Because, no matter what we have achieved, it loses its importance if the benefits of it do not go to the masses of our people and if there are many amongst our people who still remain and feel underiprivileged. This is our major and first duty today to see how we can minimise this inequality and help those people who are most in need of our help.

I am fully conscious of the rights of the minorities. We must also pay the greatest, and speedy attention to all their right demands

One hon. member said that the essence of democracy is debate. I entirely agree with him This is so, but it also means getting the job done. Now we spend a great deal of time on debate. Very often this clarifies many issues I am not at all against debate, but I think we must at least give the same effort and cooperation in getting the job done. If we can work out this problem, then of course the debates would also have more point As it is, in a debate many points are expressed. But most people go in different directions and the net result of it is not the kind of action that can have meaning for the people.

In the President's Address, it was not possible to outline more clearly certain aspects of policy. That will be clearer in the next session But certainly the Address gave some idea of what is to be done immediately. These we must take up as national problems and see that we solve them. We must see that the extremely diffi-

cult period through which we are passing, is not with courage and that whatever unity can be is brought about so that we are cleared of it. Although the situation is grim, our people do have the courage and the capacity to meet it. It is up to us to help them to do so. My plea to the hon. members is that they should commend the President's Address to the people, that through what it has outlined we should be able to take at least one step forward in the right direction.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या स्पष्टीकरण के तौर पर कुछ सवाल नहीं पूछे जा सकेंगे ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : एक ही सवाल पूछ सकते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : माननीय सदस्य, श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर, एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहते हैं।

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर (सहरसा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज से छः महीने किन्तु माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी बिहार गई थी और उन्होंने गया, पालामऊ और मुंगेर के जमुई इलाके का दौरा किया था। वह 1 अप्रैल को भी बिहार गई थीं। बिहार के एक प्रमुख अखबार इंडियन नेशन में बिहार के एक मंत्री ने कहा है कि सिर्फ गया जिले में 157 व्यक्तियों की मृत्यु भूख से हुई है। मैं प्रधान मंत्री से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि बिहार के अन्य जिलों में भी इसी तरह बड़े पैमाने पर जो भुखमरी है, उसके लिये वह अविलम्ब क्या व्यवस्था करने जा रही है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have only given information.

श्री मधु लिमये : माननीय सदस्य गये जिले में भूख से हुई मौतों के बारे में पूछ रहे हैं। वह यह जानना चाहते हैं कि क्या प्रधान मंत्री की जानकारी में यह बात आई है।

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर : प्रधान मंत्री स्वयं बिहार घूम कर आई हैं, लेकिन मुझे अफ़सोस है कि अपने भाषण में उन्होंने इस बात का कोई जिक्र नहीं किया है।

श्री बलराज मधोक (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : इस डिबेट में कई माननीय सदस्यों ने काश्मीर के चुनावों के बारे में कहा था। यह विषय डैलीकेट है, तो भी मैं उम्मीद करता था कि प्रधान मंत्री इस सम्बन्ध मे कुछ कहेंगी, परन्तु उन्होंने इस बारे में कुछ भी कहना ठीक नहीं समझा। मैं समझता हूं कि इस बारे में अगर कुछ और न किया जाये, तो कम से कम एक हाई-पावर्ड प्रोब तो वहां के चुनावों के बारे मे हो।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no question. You have made a suggestion.

श्री बलराज मधोक : क्या प्रधान मंत्री इस बारे में कुछ कहेंगी ?

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : ये बातें इलैक्शन कमीशन के सामने हैं।

श्री सरजू पाण्डेय (गाजीपुर) : प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा है कि उत्तर प्रदेश की हालत बहुत खराब है। पूर्वी जिलों की—खास तौर से गाजीपुर, बलिया और आजमगढ़ की—हालत बहुत खराब है। लेकिन आज भी उन जिलों मे तकावी आदि हर तरह की सरकारी वसूलियां जारी हैं। क्या प्रधान मंत्री उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार को आदेश देंगी कि जितनी भी सरकारी वसूलियां वहां पर हो रही हैं उन जिलों में, जो कि अकालग्रस्त इलाके हैं, उन को स्थगित किया जाये ?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : हमने उन को इस बारे में पहले ही आदेश दिया है।

[श्रीमती इंद्रा गांधी]

माननीय सदस्य ने बिहार के बारे में एक सवाल पूछा है। जहां तक मेरी जानकारी है, बिहार के एक मिनिस्टर ने जो बयान दिया है, वहां के मुख्य मंत्री ने उस पर कुछ कार्यवाही की है, यानी किसी को यह देखने के लिये भेजा है।

श्री गुप्तानन्द ठाकुर: मजफ्फरपुर जिले में जो दो व्यक्तियों के भूख से मरने की खबर है, मुख्य मंत्री ने उस पर जांच कमीशन बिठाया है। मैं तो गया और सहरसा जिलों की बात कर रहा हू। वहा के लिये कोई जांच कमीशन नही बिठाया गया है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If hon. Members agree, I shall put all the amendments together to the vote of the House.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalabandi): They may be put separately.

Some hon. Members: They may be put together.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall put them together.

All the amendments were put and negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now put the original motion to the House. The question is:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:—

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 18th March, 1967."

The motion was adopted.

17.18 hrs.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT) BILL

The Minister of Law (Shri Govinda Menon): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951, be taken into consideration."

I hope, Sir, that much by way of explanation may not be necessary for the passage of this Bill. As the House knows, late in February this year an ordinance was issued under the following circumstances It was the desire of many sections of the House that after the election was completed of the Members of the Fourth Lok Sabha a 'lame duck' session of the Third Lok Sabha need not be held as was done in the previous years—1952. 1957 and 1962 In order to enable the President to summon the Fourth Lok Sabha it had to be constituted and for that purpose an amendment of the Representation of the Pepole Act was necessary. It was done by this Ordinance and the object of this Bill is to substitute that Ordinance by a regular Act of Parliament. I hope he House will unanimously approve of this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951, be taken into consideration."

Half an hour has been allotted for this Bill.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I do support this Bill, because some of us thought that this lame duck session was useless when new Members were elected in the general elections. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact

that the lame duck session gave both members, newly elected members as well as those members who were unfortunately defeated, to meet here once and exchange views. That was the main object with which the lame duck session was thought of earlier. During the lame duck session congratulations and condolences were exchanged between members. In this session, for instance, we could not meet either Shri Patil or our good friend, Shri Atulya Ghosh. If they were here, we could have expressed our sorrow on their defeat and gave them the reasons for their defeat.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to support the motion moved by the hon. Law Minister. Here I want to say something The lame duck session was summoned and then, surprisingly enough, on the suggestion of some of the members of the opposition, it was cancelled and the first session of the Fourth Lok Sabha was convened. This is the first time in the history of this Parliament that the members of the Lok Sabha who either did not contest in the general elections or were unfortunately defeated in the polls did not get an opportunity of a get together and a photograph, unlike the earlier Lok Sabhas. Added to that, some inconvenience was also caused to those members who were to retire.

I do not know what object was achieved by the Government by so readily accepting the suggestion coming from one or two Members, howsoever eminent they may be. In my opinion, it was a great mistake. What was the object achieved? If it was for economy or some other pupose, that was not achieved: The travelling expenses of the outgoing members had to be paid. Added to that, inconvenience was caused to the new members in the matter of accommodation. So, the whole arrangements became topsy turvy. The first session of the Fourth Lok Sabha also only served the same purpose for which the lame duck session was originally convened. It was called for a short duration to pass the Vote on Account.

Therefore I felt that the Government did not act wisely in this matter and no useful purpose was served, a lot of inconvenience was caused, economy was not effected and the good tradition of a farewell meeting of old friends who were to retire did not take place. All that was good in the lame duck session was lost. The unceremonious way, the way in which the retiring Members were made to go, was really most unhappy and I thought, it was not a good feature. The Government should not have acted in this way. They have not achieved any purpose; probably, only the ego of the Opposition was satisfied and nothing else.

श्री कृष्ण गुलाब देशमुख (अमरावती) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से यही अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि यह जो लेम डक सेशन कंसिल किया गया और नयी पार्लियामेंट का पहला सेशन बुलाया गया उस के बारे में मेरे मित्र ने कहा है कि नये जो मेम्बर यहां आये हैं उन को बहुत मुश्किल में पड़ना पड़ा। अभी तक यहां रहने को भी जगह नहीं है, जो फ्लैट्स हैं वह पुराने मेम्बर्स के पास है.....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: May I ask the hon. Member whether it has any relevance to the Bill?

Shri Sonavane: It is perfectly relevant. What else is relevant?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You can voice your dissatisfaction regarding accommodation.

श्री कृष्ण गुलाब देशमुख : मेरा कहने का मतलब थोड़ा आगे है। मेरा मतलब यह है कि यह जो इस वक्त सेशन बुलाया गया यह हमारे अपोजीशन के मित्र हैं इन के कारण बुलाया गया है। उन लोगों ने जो अपील की हमारी गवर्नमेंट से तो उस वक्त उन

[श्री कृष्ण गुलाब देशमुख]

को बुश करने के लिये किया गया। हम लोगो को जो कांग्रेस के मेम्बर हैं उन से पूछा भी नही गया कि यह बात करनी चाहिये या नहीं करनी चाहिये। खैर, वह बात जाने दीजिये। वह बात हो गई। लेकिन मैं यह अपील करना चाहता हू कि यह परमानेन्ट फीचर नही बनना चाहिए आज जो उस से यह बिल लाया गया है। परमानेन्ट फीचर होने वाला है और परमानन्ट फीचर के लिये मेरा कहना है वह नही होना चाहिये। यह जो कुछ किया गया उस को हम मान्यता देते हैं लेकिन जो बिल लाया गया और जो कानून बनाया जा रहा है यह हमेशा के लिये होने जा रहा है और आगे चलकर कभी भी लेम डक सेशन नही होगा, पुराने मेम्बरान आने नही पायेंगे और हमेशा के लिये यह एक अच्छी कन्वेशन वापस ली जा रही है। तो मैं यह अपील करता हू कि इस को हमेशा के लिये नही करना चाहिये। आर्डिनेंस जो निकाला गया, उस को वैलिडेट करने के लिये बिल आता तो मझे कोई ऐतराज नही था।

श्री कनिगोपाल सेन गुप्ता (पूर्णिया) मैं भी अपने मित्र की ताईद करता हू। खास कर के जो हमारे पुराने मित्र थे और जो हार गये चाहे वह इस तरफ के थे या उस तरफ के थे, वह लोग आते तो हमारे मित्रो को जो तकलीफ हो रही है मकानो के लिये, वह न होती। उन लोगो का आना अच्छा रहता। वह आ जाते, अपना मिलजुलकर जाते। आखिर पाच वर्षों के लिये यहा आते हैं तो इतने समय मे उनकी यहा कुछ स्थिति हो जाती है और वह हार गये तो तो वह तो चाहे इधर के हो चाहे उधार के हो, दोनो तरफ के हारे हैं। यह लेम डक सेशन होना बहुत जरूरी था। आज जो तकलीफ नये मेम्बरो को हो रही है वह इसलिये हो रही है कि वह लोग आ नही पाये और आते तो अपना सरेंडर करते। वैसे अब अप्रैल तक उनके लिए हो रहा है। तो यह जो उन्होने कहा, उसकी मैं ताईद करता हू। ऐसा आगे नही होना चाहिए।

Shri Sonavane: The life of the Third Lok Sabha was also cut short

Shri G Viswanathan (Wandiwash): Mr Deputy-Speaker, it was unanimously agreed by all parties including the Congress Party, to cancel the lame duck session It is surprising to know that some hon Members—I hope, they are Congress Members—oppose the cancellation of the lame duck session Probably, they want another lame duck session to be recalled I do not know This was agreed to by all parties and there is no necessity of opposing that at this late moment

Mr Deputy-Speaker: The question is

> "That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951, be taken into consideration"

Shri S M Banerjee: Sir Members have spoken let the hon Minister reply

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There was no point made, so, he does not want to reply

Shri S M. Banerjee: Why?

Shri Sonavane: If it is irrelevant, he must get up and say that it is irrelevant

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is

Shri Sonavane: He must reply to the debate

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When no new point has been made, it is not necessary for him to reply.

Shri Sonavane: He has to meet the points raised as to why the life of the Third Lok Sabha was cut short, where the economy was effected, why the inconvenience was caused to the Members and all that.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi (Cuddalore): The Minister had piloted the Bill and some hon. Members participated in the debate. Some points were made. It is the duty of the Minister to give reply to them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: At the third reading stage, he will say something.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: He must reply at the first reading stage.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have already put the motion to the vote of the House. At the third reading stage, he will make some observations.

Shri Sonavane: On a point of order, Sir.... (*Interruption.*)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, you are an eminent parliamentarian apart from being the Deputy Speaker. As you know, there have been some past traditions and conventions. The Minister may simply say, "I have nothing to add to what I have said before." But he should reply to the debate. Otherwise, it will be a dangerous thing and any Bill can be passed like that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have accepted your suggestion. As I have already said, I put the question to the vote of the House. At the third reading stage, he will say something and reply to the points made here.

Shri Sonavane: On a point of order, Sir. On every debate, at the first reading stage, the Ministers do reply. The Ordinance was required to be issued. He has explained the reasons. But when some points are made in the course of the debate on the Bill, it is essential that the Minister should reply to that. We should know what were the compelling reasons....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let me complete this process and then I would request the hon. Minister to say something at the final stage of the Bill, that is, the third reading of the Bill.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte (Kolaba): If he is to make the observations at the third reading stage, these will be out of order at that stage.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, no. The question is....

Shri Sonavane: Do we assume that the Minister has no reply to this?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: As I said, he will say something at the concluding stage. Please resume your seat.

Shri Sonavane: You should give your ruling on my point of order at the proper stage. The Minister must reply at this stage. I demand that your ruling should be there.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not a question of ruling.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the Pepole Act, 1951, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We will now take up the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. Before I put clauses to vote, I would request the Minister to say some thing (*Interruption*).

Shri Deorao Patil (Yeotmal): Why should the Chair request him?

मंत्री महोदय अगर उत्तर देना चाहते हैं तो वह अपना उत्तर दे देंगे बाकी अगर वह नहीं देना चाहते हैं तो नहीं देंगे ।

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: It is duty of the Minister to give reply. There should be no request from the Chair. (*Interruption*).

Shri Govinda Menon: I have absolutely no objection in giving a reply. Actually, I wanted to give a reply. But by that time, you, Sir, had put the question to vote and, therefore, I thought that it would be irregular and discourteous to you if I got up to make a speech at that stage. I do not want to show any discourtesy to Members of this House. I shall be the last person to show any discourtesy. I am completely in agreement with the Members who said....

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: Is he making a speech on the first reading or second reading or third reading?

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: I would like to know what proceedings are going on in the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is speaking on clause 2.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Nobody has spoken on clause 2.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no amendment.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: Then, all clauses be put to the House.

Shri Tulsidas Jadhav (Baramati): I want to speak on clause 2.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may speak. Let the Minister conclude.

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav: The First Reading is over. I think, now the Second Reading is going on.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Clause-by-clause consideration is going on. Does he want to speak?

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav: Yes; I want to speak.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, फर्स्ट रीडिंग के ऊपर कई माननीय सदस्यों ने ऐतराज उठाये . . .

Shri G. Vishwanathan: On a point of order. There is no amendment to this. When there is no amendment, how can a member speak?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can speak.

श्री तुलशी दास जाधव : जो कई माननीय सदस्यों ने आक्षेप किया उस में तथ्य है और मिनिस्टर को फर्स्ट रीडिंग के वक्त जवाब में कुछ कहना चाहिए था। अब जो लास्ट सैशन होता है, पांच साल के अन्त में जो लास्ट सैशन होता है तो उस में कोई मैम्बर को यह खयाल नहीं रहता कि हम वापिस नहीं आवेंगे और इसलिए वह अपने मकान और सामान आदि का इंतजाम भी मुनासिब तरीके से नहीं करता है। यह जो लेम डक सैशन हुआ करता है उस में आकर यह सब बंदोबस्त करके चला जाता है। अब यह जो लेम डक सैशन हुआ करता था वह अब के नहीं हुआ है और वह हमेशा के लिए बंद होने वाला है। इस के लिए मेरा कहना है कि पुराने मैम्बरों को उसके न होने से होने वाली असुविधाओं को ध्यान में रखते हुए अगर लेम डक सैशन आयन्दा किया जाय तो उचित ही होगा और इसकी मांग भी कई माननीय सदस्यों ने की है क्योंकि ऐसा न होने से मैम्बरों को बड़ी असुविधाओं का सामना करना पड़ता है। अब पांच साल के अर्से में मैम्बरों का यहां काफी अटैचमैन्ट हो जाता है, लेना देना हो जाता है और अभी तक जो रिटन नहीं होते थे वे इस लेम डक सैशन में अपना सारा लेनदेन साफ कर लेते थे और वापिस फर्नीचर खाली करके चले जाया करते थे। लेकिन ऐसी इस बार लेम डक की व्यवस्था न होने से उन मैम्बरों को काफी असुविधा का सामना करना पड़ रहा है क्योंकि उन को अपने फर्नीचर आदि खाली करने और अपना सब वाईंड अप करने के लिए खर्चा करना होता है और सामान आदि ले जाने में भारी असुविधा होती है।

इस के अतिरिक्त यह जो आइडेन्टिफिकेशन कार्ड्स मैम्बरों को दिये जाते हैं वह एक निश्चित अवधि के लिए होते हैं। अब जब उस का कुछ काम नहीं रहता क्योंकि

सेम डक सैशन है नहीं तो वह आयेगा किस लिए ? अब उस को खास तौर से अपना फ्लैट खाली करने और सामान आदि उठाने के लिए आना पड़ता है। जो उन के आइडेंटिफिकेशन कार्डस की मुद्दत है वह 16 अप्रैल तक रहती है। यहां भी ऐसा कहा गया है कि वह भी नहीं चलेगा क्योंकि सैशन दूसरा चालू हो जाने से वह आइडेंटिफिकेशन कार्डस रद्द हो जाते हैं और इस से उन लोगों को खुद अपना खर्चा करके यहां पर आना पड़ता है। अब उस हालत में जब उनको सहूलियत होगी तभी वह यहां पर आयेंगे और उस कारण उनके फ्लैटस में जो उनका ताला लगा होता है जब तक वह उसे खाली करके आप को न दे तब तक आप उन को नये मैम्बर्स को एलाट नहीं कर सकते हैं और इस कारण नये आने वाले मैम्बर्स को भी उचित आवास सम्बन्धी व्यवस्था नहीं मिल पाती है। इन कारण हम देख रहे हैं कि एक एक मकान में दो, दो मैम्बर्स रह रहे हैं और उस कारण उन्हें जो तकलीफ हो रही है उस को भी हमें देखना होगा। अब जैसा मैं ने कहा अगर वह लोग आ जायं पुराने मैम्बर्स और उनके आइडेंटिफिकेशन कार्डस ज्यादा दिन तक वैलिड रहें ताकि वह यहां पर सहूलियत से आ सकें और अपने मकान खाली करके अपना सामान लेकर अपने घरों को वापिस जा सकें यह सहूलियत उन मैम्बर्स को आप दें।

Shri Govinda Menon: As I was beginning to say, I meant no discourtesy to the House or to any Member of the House in not reply to the points raised by my friends on the earlier occasion. I should say that although it is not legally obligatory on the part of the Mover of a motion to make a reply, a reply can be made because a point was made....

Shri Sonavane: No debate is at all necessary?

Shri Govinda Menon: Even without a debate, a motion can be moved and passed in Parliament. There is no legal objection.

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi: Provided nobody talks on the motion. When somebody talks, the Minister is bound to reply.

Shri Govinda Menon: Usually a debate takes place and it is open to the mover either to reply or not. That is the legal position. A reply is usually given, but it is not obligatory to make a reply. I did not mean any discourtesy to the House. Because you had put the matter to vote, I thought that I should not intervene at that stage. I am very sorry if any misunderstanding has arisen on that account.

As was referred to by one hon. Member there was a political decision by all the different parties in this House that it would be advisable not to have the lame duck session. The lame duck session had been called to meet some time in the middle of March. But at that time elections to all the constituencies except four had taken place, and it was thought that it would be anomalous if after having elected all but four of the five hundred odd Members of the Fourth Lok Sabha, the old members were called to meet. That was the point raised and that was agreed to by the leader of the Congress Party. That was how it happened.

I do agree to the sentiments of my hon. friends that it would have been a great social occasion if the Members of the Third Lok Sabha had met, as they had done earlier in a lame duck session in 1962, 1957 and 1952. I do not remember whether on the previous occasions the elections had been completed in the way in which they were completed this time, but my recollection is that they were not completed in that manner. Therefore it was decided that since all but four Members of the Fourth Lok Sabha had been elected there

[Shri Govinda Menon]

was no reason why the Fourth Lok Sabha should not be constituted.

For enabling the constitution of the Fourth Lok Sabha this amending ordinance was issued. Some inconvenience has ensued, as has been referred to by some hon Members here. But that is no reason why this anachronism should have been allowed to prevail.

Shri Sonavane: Why was it not contemp'ated earlier?

Shri Govinda Menon: After the lame duck session had been called, these aspects of the matter were pointed out to the Prime Minister, and all the leaders of the different groups in this House agreed that this course might be adopted. That was the situation under which the ordinance was issued, and now it is necessary that the ordinance should be replaced by a regular Act of Parliament, and that is the reason for this Bill.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 1 to 3, the Enacting Formu'a and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 to 3, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Govinda Menon: I move.

"That the Bill be passed".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved

"That the Bill be passed"

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: I want to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He cannot speak now. The hon Minister has already replied. The question is....

Shri Sonavane: This is the third reading stage. Every Member has a right to speak.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: This is the third reading stage, and if you permit me, I have a right to speak.

Shri Sonavane: He will take only two minutes and let him say what he wants.

Shri K G. Deshmukh: If there is no time that is a different matter, but I have a right to speak.

Mr Deputy-Speaker: All right, let him have his say also.

श्री कृष्ण गुलाब देशमुख : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने मन्त्री महोदय का भाषण ध्यान से सुना है। उस से ऐसा मालूम होता है कि अभी जो हमारे चुनाव हुए है और उस मे बहुत से नये मेम्बर चुन कर आ गये, इस कारण से यह सेशन बुलाया गया। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध मे मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूं कि कुछ ऐसे भी प्रदेश हैं जहा अभी एनेक्शन नही हुए हैं और उस के कारण वहा के मेम्बर इस सेशन मे नही आ सके हैं। अभी जो बतलाया गया है कि सब एनेक्शन्स हो गये यह बात सही नही है।

दूसरे अगर हमेशा ऐसा ही होता रहेगा तो एक साथ तो कभी भी सब जगह चुनाव नही होगा क्योंकि हमारा देश इतना बडा है और क्लाइमेट ऐसी है कि एक साथ सब जगहो पर चुनाव नही हो सकते। अगर लेम डक सेशन हमेशा के लिये बन्द कर दिया गया तो मैं ऐसा समझता हूं कि कभी भी चुनाव मे सब लोक एक साथ चुन कर नही आ सकेंगे और वे मेम्बर पहले सेशन मे भाग नही ले सकेंगे और उन का नुकसान होगा। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हू कि इस को परमानेन्ट फीचर न किया जाये।

Shri K. Narayana Rao (Bobbili): I am not sure whether this particular piece of legislation was at all necessary. I say so—I speak subject to correction—because under the Constitution of India, it is within the dis-

cretion and power of the President to summon Parliament or to dissolve it. In ordinary circumstances, the Parliament has to be in session for a period of five years. It is not necessary to bring in a separate Bill....

Shri Sonavane: Under what article the President is to exercise the power? Talking offhand does not help.

Shri R. Narayana Rao: This is my view. I do not have the document readily available. This is his prerogative under the Constitution. The President has the power to prorogue, dissolve or call Parliament. If he wants me to explain the legal position with detailed references to the relevant articles, I may not be able to do it because I have not the document with me now.

Be that as it may, what I mean to suggest is this, that it is rather intriguing that necessity for such a Bill was felt at all. The Third Parliament was summoned in April, 1962, and in normal circumstances it would be in existence for a period of five years. But due to certain circumstances the President is pleased or the President considers that the new Parliament should be called into session earlier. What he could do within his powers under the Consitution he did. So I do not know why for this purpose any Ordiance and a subsequent enactment were considered necessary. May be I am wrong in my view. But this is what I feel.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterjee (Howrah): The hon. Member who has just spoken has not taken into consideration the fact that an Ordinance was promulgated by the President. That being so, naturally a Bill to replace it has to come before the House. That Bill has already passed two stages. So naturally this question which he has raised should not have been raised.

Shri Govinda Menon: I would like to state for the information of the hon. Member who raised the constitutional question that as soon as elections are over, it is not open to the President to call the members who have been elected by that process. Under section 73 of the Representation of the People Act 1951, Parliament or Assembly has to be constituted, and that constitution is effected by a notification by the Election Commission. It is that notification that was proposed to be made sometime in April after all the elections were over. Since it had to be done earlier, it became necessary to amend section 73 of the relevant Act. What is attempted here is to give effect to that amendment.

Shri J. Ahmad (Dhubri): I want to speak on this. I am in support of. . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No, No, he has no right to speak now.

The question is:

"That the Bill be passed".

The motion was adopted.

17.48 hrs.

LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT AND VALIDATION) BILL

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri Annasahib Shinde): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and to validate certain acquisition of land under the said Act, be taken into consideration".

The Land Acquisition Act, 1894, is applicable to the whole of India except the States of Kerala, Mysore, Rajasthan and Jammu and Kashmir which have their own laws on the subject. For acquisition of land for a public purpose, the procedure prescribed under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, is that a preliminary notification is issued under section 4(1) of the Act which indicates that a parti-

[Shri Annasahib Shinde]

cular area of land is a needed, or is likely to be needed, for a public purpose. The issue of the preliminary notifications empowers the officers of the Government to enter upon the land and make surveys etc. and enables the person interested to file objections with regard to the proposed acquisition. The Collector, after hearing these objections, makes a report to the Government and thereupon the Government makes one or more declarations under section 6 in respect of land specified in the preliminary notification stating that such land is needed for a public purpose or for a company. In case of large projects, this procedure is adopted in a phased manner and a declaration under section 6 is published only when a particular part of the land is actually needed for the project, whether for setting up of the plant, development of township, roads and other ancilary requirements. Here I may point out that the Act does not prescribe any time-limit within which declaration under section 6 should be published in respect of land covered by the initial notification under section 4(1).

Compensation which is payable by the authority or company requiring such land, is determined with reference to the market value at the date on which the preliminary notification under section 4(1) is published, irrespective of the date of issue of section 6 declaration.

In their judgment dated 9.2.1966 in the case: the State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Vishun Prasad Sharma and others the Supreme Court held that once a decralation under section 6 of the Act is issued, whether it be in respect of a part of the land or in respect of the whole of it as notified under section 4 (1), the effect of the preliminary notification is exhausted and further declarations under section 6 of the Act would be invalid. In other words, Government cannot acquire land by means of successive declarations.

The said decision of the Supreme Court posed a serious problem not only in respect of pending cases of acquisition of land for various public purposes, but also for the acquisition of land in future. Whenever land is notified for acquisition under section 4(1), it is not always possible, nor desirable, to issue the declaration under section 6 for the entire area all at once. Acquisition has to be done in stages, consistent with the requirements of the situation. The object of the preliminary notification under section 4(1) is not only to make it widely known that a particular area is required, or likely to be required, for a public purpose and to invite objections, but also to fix a date with reference to which compensation is to be fixed. The market value at the date of such notification is taken as the guiding factor to fix compensation under section 23 of the Act. This is an essential part of the scheme of the Act. It takes note of the fact that as soon as Government's intention to acquire any land becomes widely known, the land prices tend to increase sharply. Even speculation in land is not unknown. The preliminary notification under section 4 (1) therefore has the effect of pegging thte prices of land. The preliminary notification is then followed by one or more declarations under section 6 in accordance with the phasing of the project in hand.

17.55 hrs.

[SHRI G. S. DHILLON *in the Chair*]

In the nature of things, it would be impossible to reopen all such cases where one preliminary notification under section 4(1) has been followed by successive declarations. To issue fresh preliminary notifications under section 4(1) would seriously dislocate projects for which part of land has already been acquired and compensation paid.

Consequently, to overcome the difficulties arising from the interpretation of the principal Act, and also to validate the cases immediately in hand,

an Ordinance was promulgated on the 20th January, 1967. In the Bill which has followed, we propose to provide for submission of more than one declaration under section 6 and incidentally to provide for submission of one or more reports under section 5A. The amendment is of a permissive character.

At the same time, care has been taken to ensure that the land acquisition proceedings, after the issue of the preliminary notification under section 4(1), do not linger on for unduly long time. The Bill, therefore, provided that no declaration under section 6 can be issued after the expiry of three years from the date of preliminary notification under section 4(1). In case of pending proceedings, it has been provided in the Bill that no declaration in respect of any part of the land covered by the preliminary notification, may be issued after the expiry of two years from the commencement of the Ordinance. To relieve the hardship of those owners of land in whose case there has been a time-lag of more than three years from the date of preliminary notification, it is proposed to make a provision in the Bill for which I am moving a separate amendment for payment of interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum on the compensation.

It will thus be noticed that opportunity has been taken of the amendment to prescribe a firm time-limit within which section 6 declaration must be published and in case of the pending proceedings which are sought to be validated by the Bill, interest will be payable in the event of delay beyond three years. The publication of last declaration under section 6 in pending cases is also proposed to be restricted to within two years of the date of the Ordinance.

The Government of India have been conscious of the various problems which attend the acquisition of land, not the least of which is the question of administrative delays. This causes much hardship to the owners of land. In cases of large projects, the problem of rehabilitation of the evicted families also calls for remedial measures. Further, it has been the policy of the Government to avoid acquisition of good agricultural land as far as possible. There are however instances in which good agricultural land has been acquired, resulting in loss of agricultural production.

In the past, the Law Commission of India examined the scheme of the Land Acquisition Act and made certain recommendations. More recently, my Minister also set up a Committee of officials to examine remedial measures against delays and other difficulties caused by the acquisition of land for various development projects. Although, the Committee has submitted its report, in view of the wide public concern, Government would like to constitute a Committee of Members of both Houses to go into the entire scheme of the principal Act. Since the subject is in the Concurrent List, representatives of various States will have to be associated with such a Committee. To conform to the Constitutional provisions, it would also be necessary to associate legal experts with the Committee. I would like to give this assurance to the House on behalf of the Government while commending the Bill to be passed.

The House may consider the Bill in the light of this situation.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and to validate certain acquisitions of land under the said Act, be taken into consideration."

There are some amendments for eliciting public opinion and others for reference to the Select Committee. We can take them as moved.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): But are the Members moving those amendments?

Shri Dattatraya Kunte (Kolaba): Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill.

An hon. Member: Let the motion for circulation be moved first.

Mr. Chairman: The first motion is in the name of Mr. Yashpal Singh. Is he here? No. So, it is not moved. Various Members have sent in their motions: Shri Kanwarlal Gupta, Shri Imam; they are not present here in Yashpal Singh, Shri Mohammad the House; so they are not moved.

18 hrs.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: Sir, I rise to oppose the Bill. I have very patiently heard the hon. Minister, while he was making his observations, and I have not found any valid reason in support of the Bill which he has moved. He has only pointed out certain administrative difficulties which are of the making of the officers of the Government. This is an old Act, as old as 70 years, but during the last 20 years, we have found that the principle and the policy underlying this Act have been flagrantly abused by the powers that be, and therefore, on more than one occasion, it has become necessary for the Supreme Court to bring the Government to the right path, but the result has been that when the Supreme Court has given its decisions, this Government has misused the legislative powers of this House to amend the Act in such a manner as to get over the lawful interpretations of the Act put in by the Supreme Court. It will be found that the words "public purpose" were so interpreted by the officers of the Government in different States that this House has to take seriously into consideration what exactly the "public purpose" was. Here is a Bill which is trying to validate Acts which are void *ab initio*. If we look into the scheme of the Act, we find that it lays down that there shall be a notification under section 4, and then when that notification is issued, the public ought to take into consideration that this land is wanted for a specific purpose. The Minister in charge said, because of a phased programme, there is no clear picture, and then he gives away his own case, saying that therefore there is no specific public purpose for which that notification is issued. Under these circumstances, one would expect the Government and those who require that this legislation should be passed, that they will go into specific recommendations and suggestions and then only the notification under section 4 will issue. Once the notification under section 4 is issued, it has become very difficult for the owner of the land to enter into any transaction anywhere, which means his fundamental right of disposing of his land anyway he likes is completely curtailed. But the scheme of the Act, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is very clear: that there shall be a notification, and on the notification there shall be a report, and on that report there shall be recommendation and thereafter the final order or the declaration. Here, the Minister is coming and asking us that because it is a phased programme and therefore there has got to be more than one report and more than one declaration, let us validate them and let us pass this Bill because an ordinance has been passed.

I really want to question the very intentions of this Bill. Is it not a fact that the Government is trying to validate Acts which are *ab initio* void? And I do not think that this amendment would give them the result that they are wanting to have.

Then there is another point; the Minister was saying as if all these acquisitions of land are meant for projects which have a definite purpose. I want to refer to a very old case; the Badrinarayan Temple has certain lands in the city of Bombay. These lands are in the possession of the Defence Department; they are so for the last few years: I do not know

whether it is from the first world war or the second world war. The land comprises as many as 17 acres. They are only paying them some annual rental, and the only use that has been made of these 17 acres for the past 25 years and more is that a small railway link passes through this land. Beyond this, all the 17 acres are put to no use and the Badrinarayan Temple is paid some rent on the basis of some old prices. The very fact that the notification under section 4 makes it incumbent that the owner of the land will not get more compensation than the price prevailing at the time when the notification is issue makes it necessary for this House to take a serious note of this matter.

There is another very recent case. Across the island of Bombay, there is another place called Uran in my constituency where the defence department at one stage for their naval depot acquired 1100 acres of land. To the displaced persons compensation was paid, but they were not looked after. Government did not care to build houses for them or to give alternative service to them, though promises were made. As much as 75 per cent of this land is today not used for the purpose for which it was acquired. From year to year it is being let out to those old owners on a rental basis for cultivation. Yet, the defence department has again come forward for acquiring another 300 acres of land adjoining the 1100 acres for another branch of the defence department. When it was pointed out to them that here is 900 acres of land not being used and the other branch of the defence department wants to have it, but the first branch does not want to part with those 900 acres of land.

How was the notification issued? It is a funny picture. On the coast of Uran, there are certain bungalows of officers belonging to the defence department who do not belong to that place at all. They do not work in Uran; they are serving some where else. They are excluded from the notification under section 4. But other lands where the people have got houses have ben notified. Before we consider this Bill seriously, I would like to know whether the minister has applied his mind to such problems at all. He has not cited even one case. He does not even know, I am afraid, how many such cases are pending for how many years. Beyond paraphrasing the statement of objects and resons, he has not given any details. He should have really supplied information to this House about how many cases are pending in how many States and who is responsible for the delay. To say an officer dose not know how much of the land will be required is begging the question. It only means that while issuing the notification, neither the Government nor the persons who ask for the acquistion are clear in their minds. The Land Acquestions Act is absolutely abused and therefore the Supreme Court has to come down a heavey hand every time.

The minister was pleased to tell us that there was no time-limit before for those reports and declarations and now there will be a time-limit. The amendment about giving interest at 6 percent is an after thought; it is not before the House at this stage and therefore, I would not like to consider it. What is the intention of the Government? Was it the intention of the framers of the Act in 1894 that the owner of the land get the price prevailing on the date when the notification was issued under section 4? If that was not the intention of the farmers of the Act, Government might well come up with a new Act and not try to read something which dose not exist in the original Act. This is really an absolute misuse of the powers that are there, especially when lands are being acquired, it is expected that additional compensation will be paid.

I see from the notices of Bills that have been circulated, there is a Bill by a certain hon. Member wherein he wants the prevailing land price to be paid—'prevailing' means at the time

[Shri Dattatraya Kunte]

when final declaration comes and not at the time when the notification is issued under section 4.

An hon. Member: It is a non-official Bill.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: It is a non-official Bill. If it is a healthy suggestion the Government ought to accept it. It is expected of Government to accept healthy suggestions, and that is why I made a reference to that.

I want to ask, does the Minister know how many cases are there. I am prepared to yield place to him in case he is prepared to give some cases at least in respect of one State. Last time when the Supreme Court passed the judgment in the Kanpur case it was found that "public purpose" was something different from what is in the dictionary. Now we find that the Act says, there shall be a notification, there shall be a report and there shall be a declaration. The scheme is complete by itself. But to imagine something which is not part of the Act and to super-impose it because certain officers of the Government have not understood the Act, is really an injustice to the owners of the land. Therefore, one would have expected this Government to say, all right, our officers have committed mistakes and therefore we will again notify those lands. Nothing would have happened as it has happened in a number fo cases. I know, for instance, when I was Chairman of the Housing Board, Bombay. Because certain lands which were notified did not include certain lands which were surrounded by the lands included in the notification, fresh notifications were issued simultaneously and the first notifications withdrawn. Instead of coming with such a legislation because an ordinance was hurriedly issued, rather wa expected the hon. Minister . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: Sir, this is an important Bill and complete discussion ought to be allowed on this matter.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh (Amravati): But we have to finish within the time allotted.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: This is a very serious matter. Land acquisition is not a simple matter.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: The hon. Member ought to have persuaded the Business Advisory Committee to give more time for this.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: When such an important legislation is being considered, if the Business Advisory Committee did not understand the import of it, it does not mean that a Member should not have his full say in the matter. The hon. Minister said that it is Government's policy not to acquire agricultural lands. Then why are lands in Uran being acquired when bungalows are there. Is he prepared to give a promise that people in this area will not be dishoused before alternative accommodation is provided for them and also suitable services are offered to them? Otherwise, Sir, it will not be correct to pass such Bills. While passing such Bills they make very laudable declarations, but once they become Acts and those Acts are enforced they forget those laudable declarations. That has been the tale of the past. I expected that in the first Session of the Fourth Lok Sabha that tale would not be repeated, and not having seen that I have the solemn duty to oppose this Bill with all my strength.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Chairman: Shri Madhok—.. ..

An Hon. Member: Sir, I gave my name first.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Bhubaneshwar): Sir, I have given some amendments.

Mr. Chairman: I know.

श्री बलराज मधोक (दक्षिण दिल्ली) : सभापति महोदय, मैं इस विधेयक का विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं । यह विधेयक अदालत के एक फैसले को रद्द करने के लिए लाया जा रहा है । भारत में अंग्रेजों ने कानून बनाया था भूमि को अधिग्रहण करने के लिए 1894 में एक कानून बनाया था । उस की धारा 4 के मुताबिक गवर्नमेंट किसी जमीन को नोटिफाई कर सकती है कि हमें सरकारी काम के लिए या पब्लिक काम के लिए आवश्यक होगी । उस के ऊपर धारा 5 के मुताबिक कुछ आब्जेक्शन करने की इजाजत है और फिर धारा 6 के मुताबिक गवर्नमेंट घोषणा कर सकती है कि वे इस जमीन के लिये कितना मुआवजा देंगे ? कुछ विशेष परिस्थितियों के अन्दर यह कानून बनाया गया होगा । उस के बाद हालात बदल चुके हैं मगर भूमि अधिग्रहण कानून वही चला आ रहा है । उसी कानून के मुताबिक आज्ञाओं के बाद सरकार ने जगह जगह पर जमीनों को नोटिफाइ करना शुरू किया । यह बिल मध्य प्रदेश में भूमि अधिग्रहण के विषय में उच्च न्यायालय में हुये एक फैसला के विरुद्ध लाया गया है । वहां 1949 में 11 गावों को नोटिफाई कर दिया गया उसके बाद सरकार आहिस्ता २ जमीन लेती गई और उसमें से 600 एकड़ जमीन 1966 में ली गई । नोटिफाई किया 1949 में और जमीन ली गई 1966 में और कम्पेन्सेशन वहीं दिया गया जो कि 1949 में था ।

उस पर वहां के लोग अदालत में मामला ले गए । अदालत ने उन की बात ठीक समझी और कहा कि यह बात गलत है । चाहिए तो यह था कि सरकार अदालत के फैसले के सामने सिर झुकाती और इस खामी को दूर करती और उन लोगों के साथ जिन की जमीन 1966 में ली गई लेकिन कम्पेन्सेशन 1949 का दिया गया, न्याय करती । मगर ऐसा न कर के न्यायालय के फैसले को रद्द करने के लिये यह एक आर्डिनेंस से आये और अब उसी आर्डिनेन्स को कानून की शकल देने के लिए यह बिल लाया गया है ।

सभापति महोदय, इस कानून के बारे में जो सब से बड़ी आपत्ति की बात है वह यह है कि इस के अनुसार जो जमीन का मालिक है जिस की जमीन नोटिफाई की जाती है उस का कोई अधिकार छोड़ा ही नहीं गया । हमें अपने संविधान के अन्दर कुछ फंडामेंटल राइट्स दिए गए हैं । यह ठीक है कि सार्वजनिक कार्य के लिए हम जमीन ले सकते हैं मगर पब्लिक परपज क्या है इसका जस्टिफिकेशन क्या है यह कोई बताने को तैयार नहीं है । मध्य प्रदेश के यह 11 गांव जो 1949 में नोटिफाई किए गए मगर 1966 तक अधिग्रहण की कार्यवही नहीं मुक मल नहीं की गई । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि 17 साल तक क्या होता रहा ? जिस की जमीन नोटिफाई की जाती है वह कुछ कर नही सकता, उसे बेच नहीं सकता । उसका विकास नहीं कर सकता और इस प्रकार देश की लाखों एकड़ जमीन जाया पड़ी हुई है । जो जमीन के मालिक हैं उन को उस का मुआवजा नहीं मिलता और उस जमीन का उचित उपयोग भी नहीं हो रहा है ।

इस की सब से भयानक मिसाल देश की राजधानी दिल्ली में मिलती है । 1959में दिल्ली की लगभग 34 हजार एकड़ जमीन इसी धारा 4के मुताबिक कीज कर दी गई, बन्द कर दी गई । एक साल बाद 16 हजार एकड़ जमीन और कीज कर दी

[श्री बलराज मधोक]

गई। इस प्रकार लगभग जितनी जमीन दिल्ली की है जिस के ऊपर मकान बनाये जा सकते थे या जो खेती के अन्दर थी उसे फ्रीज कर दिया गया मगर उसे डेवलप नहीं किया गया। लगभग 52 हजार एकड़ जमीन जो फ्रीज की गई उस में से अभी तक एक्वायर की गई केवल 22 हजार एकड़ और जो एक्वायर की गई है उसमें से भी डेवलप की गई है केवल 5070 एकड़ और बाकी सारी जमीन खाली पड़ी हुई है। उस जमीन पर खेती हो सकती है न उस जमीन का मालिक उस जमीन को बेच सकता है और नहीं उस का मुआवजा मिला है। जब जब सरकार का जी करता है वह उस को एक्वायर करती जाती है। जमीन एक्वायर अब करते हैं मगर मुआवजा कहते हैं कि वही देंगे जो 1959 में देते। परिणाम क्या हो रहा है? अभी यहां पर कुछ कोआपरेटिव सोसाइटीज बनाई गई। उन्हें जमीन देने की बात हुई। उन को कहा गया कि तुम्हें जमीन दी जायगी 8 रुपये गज वर्ग के हिसाब से लेकिन वह जमीन गवर्नमेंट ने जिन लोगों से ली हुई है उन को 60 पैसे, 80 पैसे, एक रुपया, दो रुपया गज मुआवजा दिया गया। मगर वही जमीन कोआपरेटिव सोसायटी को 8 रुपये गज देंगे और प्लाटेड एरिया की कीमत तो उस से दूनी यानी 16 रुपये गज होगी। इतना ही नहीं, वह जमीन जो सरकार ने खुद डेवलप की उस में खर्चा होता है 6 रुपये या 8 रुपये गज और सरकार उसे बेच रही है 30 रुपये से लेकर 300 और 500 रुपये गज तक। दिल्ली के अन्दर जितना प्राबलम हाउसिंग का पैदा हुआ है वह इसी करण पैदा हुआ है कि सारी जमीन सरकार ने ले ली और फिर उसका ब्लेक मार्केटिंग शुरु किया, प्राफिटि- यरिंग शुरु किया। इस का लाभ केवल गवर्नमेंट को हुआ। उस से कन्जयूमर भी मरा, मकान बनाने वाला भी मरा और जिसकी जमीन थी, जो मालिक था उसके साथ अन्याय हुआ। इतना ही नहीं कुछ जमीन ऐसी थी जो कि लैंड ओनर्स ने उस के पहले या फ्रीज आर्डर के तुरन्त पहले कुछ लोगों को बेच दी थी और वहां पर कुछ कालोनाइजर्स ने कालोनीज खड़ी कर दी थी। कुछ प्राइवेट लोगों ने भी जमीन ली थी चार रुपये गज, 6 रुपये गज 8 रुपये गज। वहां पर उन्होंने अपने मकान बनाये और इस वक्त दिल्ली के अन्दर लगभग 1 लाख मकान इस प्रकार की जमीन पर बने हुए हैं और उनमें लोग रह रहे हैं। अब जो ये सारी जमीनें एक्वायर की जा रही हैं, यह उन लोगों के ऊपर एक दोहरी मार है—एक तो वह जमीन, जिस पर वे मकान बना कर बैठे हुए हैं, उनसे वे मकान छीने जा रहे हैं, उन को बेघर बनाने की बात की जा रही है, दूसरे कहा जाता है कि तुम्हें बेघर भी करेंगे, जमीन भी छीनेंगे, मगर कम्पेन्सेशन देंगे, वह जो 1959 में था। उन्होंने 15 रू० 20 रु० गज में वह जमीन पड़ी है, लेकिन उन को देंगे एक रुपये, दो रुपये गज। इस प्रकार से लाखों लोगों के बेघर और कंगाल होने की सम्भावना पैदा हो गई है।

दिल्ली में किस प्रकार इस कानून का दुरुपयोग हो रहा है, इसका एक और उदाहरण आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। दिल्ली में बहुत से गांव हैं, इन गावों का बन्दोबस्त सन 1908 में हुआ था और तब उन गावों का लाल-डोरा तय हुआ था, उन गांवों की सीमा निश्चित की गई थी। उस के बाद जिस तरह से आबादी बढ़ी, यह आप सब जानते हैं। लेकिन लालडोरा वहीं सीमित रहा है और उसके बाहर की जमीनों को सरकार द्वारा एक्वायर कर लिया गया है। अब गांववालों के परिवार बढ़ गये हैं अगर वे अपने बढ़े हुए परिवार के लिये मकान बनाना चाहते हैं, तो

बना नहीं सकते, इस कारण आज बहुत से गांव उजड़ रहे हैं। नरैना गांव दिल्ली का एक बड़ा गांव है, उस के इर्द-गिर्द जितनी जमीन है, जहां पर लोगों के मकान बने हुए हैं, उन को लिया जा रहा है, लोगों के मकान तोड़े जा रहे हैं और उन को मुआवजा न के बराबर दिया जा रहा है।

दिल्ली का जो सिवेज का पानी जाता था, उस से इर्द-गिर्द के इलाके में काफी अच्छी खेती होती थी। ओखले के पास कुछ गांव हैं जहां उस पानी को इस्तेमाल कर के काफी अच्छी खेती होती थी उस से कारपोरेशन को भी 10-15 हजार रुपये साल की आमदनी होती थी क्योंकि वे उस पानी को खेती के काम के लिये दे देते थे। इस पानी से हजारों एकड़ अनाज पैदा होता था। लेकिन वह जमीन भी ले ली गई है। अब वहां न खेती हो सकती है और न अनाज पैदा हो सकता है और इस तरह से कारपोरेशन को जो आमदनी होती थी वह भी खत्म हो गई है। खाली जमीन पड़ी हुई है, उसे नोटिफाई कर दिया गया है, किसानों से जमीन छीन ली गई हैं लेकिन कम्पेन्सेशन नहीं मिला है वहा पर खेती नहीं होने दी जाती जो अनाज वहां पर पैदा हो सकता था, जो तीन-चार फसलें हो सकती थी वह अब नहीं हो सकती। यह कैसी नीति है? उसका कोई भी जस्टीफिकेशन नहीं है। यह "डाग इन दी मेन्जर" की नीति है, न हम कुछ करेंगे और न दूसरों को करने देंगे।

अच्छा तो यह था कि हाई कोर्ट ने जो फैसला किया था, उसकी लाइट में इस कानून मे संशोधन करते, लेकिन ऐसा करने के बजाय आपने आर्डिनेंस निकाल कर उस फैसले को खत्म कर दिया, और अब इस को कानून की शक्ल देने जा रहे हैं। यह एक गलत कार्यवाही है। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि वे एक कमेटी मुकर्रर करेंगे जो इस बारे में पुनर्विचार करेगी, मगर मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि इस बिल को लाने की जल्दी क्या थी, थोड़ा इन्तजार किया जा सकता था। यह भी सुझाव दिया गया है कि इस बिल को पब्लिक ओपीनियम लेने के लिये प्रसारित किया जाय, मैं भी यही कहना चाहता हूं कि थोड़ा इन्तजार कर लीजिये, जल्दी न कीजिये, और एक कम्प्रीहेन्सिव कानून बनाइये जो जरूरियात को पूरा कर सके। आज जो बिल पेश किया गया है यह हमारी आवश्यकताओं को, जरूरियात को पूरा नहीं कर सकता, इस लिये एक कमेटी मुकर्रर कीजिये, उस में पार्लियामेंन्ट के मेम्बर्स हों राज्य के मेंम्बरर्स भी लिये जा सकते हैं, क्योंकि यह कानकरेक्ट सब्जेक्ट है वह कमेटी इस पर विचार करे, उस के बाद सुझाव दे और तब उस के आधार पर एक नया कम्प्रीहेन्सिव कानून बने और उसके अनुसार आगे काम किया जाय। इस समय लोगों के साथ जो अन्याय हो रहा है, उस को बन्द किया जाय।

जो जमीन आपने ली है, उस के सम्बन्ध में अब कहा गया है कि डिनोटिफाई तीन साल मे करेंगे, तीन साल में निर्णय करेंगे तीन साल क्यों? जिस वक्त जमीन को एक्वायर करते हैं, नोटिफाई करते हैं, उस वक्त आपके पास प्लान होना चाहिये कि कितनी जमीन की आपको जरूरत है। गवर्मेन्ट के पास इतने रिसोर्सेज हैं, इतने साधन हैं, फिर भी वे तय नहीं कर सकते कि उसको कितने सालों में डेवलप करेंगे। जब गवर्मेन्ट का यह हाल है, तो प्राइवेट आदमी क्या कर सकता है। तीन साल का समय लेने का कोई सवाल नहीं है, यह तो केवल आखों में धूल झोंकने वाली बात है, इस से कुछ नहीं बनेगा।

इस लिये मेरा अनुरोध है कि इस बिल को वापस लिया जाय, अगर वापस नहीं लिया जाता तो इसे पब्लिक ओपीनियन जानने के लिये परिचालित किया जाय इस बीच जिस कमेटी का सुझाव दिया गया है

[श्री बलराज मधोक]

उस को मुकर्रिर किया जाय और उसे कमेटी के इस कानून के तमाम पहलुओं पर विचार करने के बाद इस बिल को उसे के मुताबिक ढाला जाय और तब तक जिनकी जमीनें ली गई हैं, उन को कम्पेसेशन दिया जाय । यह कम्पेसेशन आज की जो मार्केट वैल्यू है उसके मुताबिक दिया जाय । गवर्नमेंट दूसरों को कहती है कि ब्लैक मार्केट करते हैं, प्राफिटीयरिंग करते हैं, लेकिन यहां पर वह खुद प्राफिटीयरिंग और ब्लैक मार्केटिंग करना चाहती है, इस लिये गवर्नमेंट खुद इस ब्लैक मार्केटिंग को बन्द करे वरना दिल्ली के अन्दर हाउसिंग प्राबलम और भयानक होता चला जायगा मैं उम्मीद करता हूं कि इस सुझाव पर मंत्री महोदय विचार करेंगे और इस बिल को अभी पास होने के लिये जिद नहीं करेंगे ।

श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश (बाहा-दिल्ली) : चेयरमैन साहब, जिस तरह से और जिस शक्ल में यह बिल सामने आया है. मैं उसका विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूं क्योंकि यह बिल काश्तकारों के साथ.....

Shri Somavane (Pandharpur): Sir, there is no quorum in the House.

Mr. Chairman: Let the bell be rung..... now there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue his speech.

श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश : मैं कह रहा था कि यह जो बिल है यह दिल्ली के और हिन्दुस्तान के काश्तकारों के साथ बड़ी जबरदस्त बेइन्साफ़ी है और जिस शक्ल में यह बिल आया है वह उस मन्शा के खिलाफ़ है जो हाई कोर्ट और सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसलों में जाहिर हुई हैं । यह बिल इस सम्बन्ध में जो ला-कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है, उस के भी खिलाफ है और अभी गवर्नमेंट ने जो अभी एक कमेटी एक्सपर्टस की बुलाई थी जॉइन्टियल कमेटी और जिसकी रिपोर्ट भी शायद महीना भर हुआ है, निकली है यह उसकी मन्शा के भी खिलाफ है । अजीब बात है कि हाई कोर्ट के फैसले, सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसले, ला-कमीशन की रिपोर्ट जो कि गवर्नमेंट का मुकर्रिर किया हुआ कमीशन था या एक्सपर्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट, इन सब की मन्शा के खिलाफ यह बिल यहां पर पेश किया जाय, इस को देख कर मुझे अफसोस होता है ।

मुझे दिल्ली के कुछ थोड़े से मामले मालूम हैं कि यहां किस तरह से यह समझ कर कि 1981 तक या दिल्ली का डवेलपमेंट का प्लान चलाना है, लिहाजा उस के लिये जमीनें अभी से एक्वायर कर दी जायं, सन् 1959 में कोई 35 हजार एकड़ जमीन एक्वायर की गई और अब तक कोई 60 हजार एकड़ जमीन एक्वायर हो चुकी है । जिनमें ऐसे बहुत से केसेज पड़े हुए हैं कि 5-6 साल बीत जाने पर भी उन का कम्पेन्सेशन अभी तक नहीं दिया गया है और कम्पेन्सेशन देने का जो तरीका है, वह भी गलत है ला-कमीशन और एक्सपर्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के मुताबिक । यह जो कहा गया है कि खेती की जमीन न ली जाये क्योंकि कमीशन की रिपोर्ट है और और एक्सपर्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है कि जहां तक हो सके खेती की जमीन न ली जाये....

श्री सुरेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी (उज्जैन) : सभापति महोदय यहां कैबिनेट का कोई मंत्री नहीं है । यह इतने महत्व का विधेय है लेकिन फिर भी मंत्रिमंडल का कोई मंत्री उपस्थित नहीं है । ....(व्यवधान) मंत्रिमंडल का मंत्री उपस्थित होना जरूरी है । मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि तुरन्त मंत्री महोदय को बुलाया जाये ।

शिक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री भाग्यल झा आजाद) : इस की कोई जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : आप रूलिंग को देखिये तो पता चलेगा कि सदन के अन्दर कोई कैबिनेट का मंत्री जरूर उपस्थित रहना चाहिये।

श्री हा० ना० तिवारी : (गोपालगंज) राज्य-मंत्री बिल के इंचार्ज हैं वह उपस्थित हैं।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : यह सदन की अवहेलना है। मंत्री नहीं हैं।

Shri Annasahib Shinde: I have moved the Bill. I am here.

18.31 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश : मैं कह रहा था कि जो उसूल लैंड ऐक्विजिशन के सम्बन्ध में ला कमिशन और एक्सपर्ट कमेटी ने रक्खे हैं उन उसूलों का इस बिल में ध्यान नहीं रक्खा गया है, और इस बिल की रूह से हिन्दुस्तान के हजारों, लाखों किसानों के ऊपर एक तरह से बड़ा अन्याय है। इस बिल में कहा गया है कि तीन साल के अन्दर अन्दर अगर दफा 4 की नोटिस न आये तो तीन साल के अन्दर कोई दूसरा नोटिफिकेशन आ जाये। लेकिन दूसरे नोटिस के लिये कोई समय निर्धारित नहीं किया गया है। वह पांच साल भी चल सकता है, छः साल भी चल सकता है और दस साल भी चल सकता है। इस लिये यह बड़ी जबर्दस्त कमी है और तीन साल की जो पाबन्दी लगाई गई है उस का कोई मतलब नहीं रह जाता।

एक उसूल रखा गया है कि जमीन उतनी ही ऐक्वायर होनी चाहिये जितने को ऐक्वायर करने के लिये आप के पास बजट में प्राविजन हो। जितना आप रुपया देकर के ऐक्वायर कर सकें। मैं यह कह सकता हूं कि दिल्ली की जमीन को ऐक्वायर करने के लिये जो नोटिस दिया गया है उस को ऐक्वायर करने के लिये कम से कम 100 करोड़ रुपया चाहिये। 100 करोड़ रुपया अगले 30 या 40 सालों में भी गवर्नमेंट देने को तैयार नहीं होगी ताकि उतना देकर जमीन को ऐक्वायर किया जा सके।

आप को मालूम ही होगा कि जिस जमीन के लिये नोटिस दिया जाता है आम तौर से किसान उस पर इन्वेस्टमेंट करना छोड़ देता है। यहां मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि जिस जमीन के लिये दफा 6 के मातहत आपकी तरफ से नोटिस दिया गया और जिसका कब्जा ले लिया गया, वह बेकार पड़ी हुई है सालों से। देहात की जो खेती की जमीन है जिसमें कुंएं हैं, पानी है, अच्छी सब्जियां वहां उगती थीं। हम ने कहा कि यह जमीन आप काश्तकारों के हवाले कर दें और जब तक आप इस्तेमाल न करें, जब तक आपके पास उसका इस्तेमाल नहीं है, तब तक के लिये वह फल फूल उगा सकें, सब्जियां उगा सकें, तो उस को भी मना कर दिया गया और कहा गया कि अगर दुबारा उसे काश्तकारों को दे दिया जायेगा तो वह लोग बाद में उस पर कब्जा कर लेंगे और उसको वापस नहीं करेंगे। लिहाजा वह जमीन बेकार पड़ी हुई है।

जहां कहा गया कि हम एक कमेटी बनायेंगे, तो मैं कहता हूं कि आप उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट का इन्तजार करें। पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी का बहुत अच्छा सुझाव है और इस बिल को इस वक्त पास करने की जरूरत नहीं है। इस को आप इल्तवा में डाल दीजिये और कमेटी मुकर्रर कर दीजिये। जमीन को हमेशा के लिये लेने का जो फैसला है वह हमेशा के लिये न किया जाये। कमेटी में भेजिये जिस में कि कितने समय के लिये लिया जाये यही नहीं बल्कि

[श्री ब्रह्म प्रकाश]

कितना कम्पेन्सेशन दिया जाये इस का भी फैसला ठीक तरह से हो सके।

बातें तो बहुत सी कहने की हैं मैं उन सब बातों के अन्दर नहीं जाना चाहता, जो सा कमीशन की रिपोर्ट और एक्सपर्ट कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पढ़ेंगे उन के सामने साफ हो जायेगा कि यह जो बिल है यह सब तरह से उन उसूलों के खिलाफ है जो कि इसमें दिये गये हैं। लिहाजा मैं मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस बिल के पास करने में वह जल्दी न करें और पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी जल्दी से जल्दी नियुक्त कर दें जो कि अगले सेशन तक अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दे ताकि एक पीसमील बिल नहीं बल्कि एक काम्प्रेहेन्सिव बिल लैंड ऐक्विजिशन पर आ सके ताकि जहां हिन्दुस्तान के किसानों के साथ अन्याय न हो, जहां दिल्ली के किसानों के साथ भी अन्याय न हो वहां इस मद के लिये वह जमीन इस्तेमाल होगी उस के साथ भी अन्याय न हो।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो कारण मैं ने दिये हैं उन की वजह से मैं इस बिल का विरोध करता हूं।

Shri V. Krishnamoorthi (Cuddalore): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to point out some of the technical difficulties which are likely to arise if we pass this Bill in its present form. Therefore, I would suggest that the Bill may be referred to a Select Committee in order that it may be improved upon and not passed it very hastily in this manner.

This Bill has been brought forward by the hon. Minister in order to obviate the difficulties pointed out by the Supreme Court in the manner of notification, report and determination of the acquisition and also in order to shorten the period for the notification under section 4 and the declaration under 6 of the Act.

I would like to state that we do require land for public purpose. We are, therefore, not at all questioning that. There should not be any obstacle in the way of acquisition of land for reasonable purposes at reasonable prices and within a reasonable time. But I have to pity the land-owners of Madhya Pradesh whose lands were notified in 1949 and who would be paid compensation only at the 1949 price. The Supreme Court has nullified the notification and has stated that it is unjust to put these land-owners to loss because under the Act as it stands now, the owners of land in Madhya Pradesh have to receive compensation only at the price prevalent in 1949. My appeal to the Government as well as to you is this. Is it just on our part to make the people suffer in this manner? Then the Supreme Court has decided it as unjust, we should not try to cirumvent it by again validating those provisions which the Supreme Court has decided as unjust in this particular case my summission is that the owners of the land have been deprived of the right to own property and the right to get just market value for the land.

Therefore, I would plead that the hon. Minister may circulate the Bill for elicitng public opinion thereon, or have it referred to a Select Committee. Clause 4 of the Bill seeks to validate some of the provisions or some of the notifications which were struck down by the Madhya Pradesh High Court and upheld by the Supreme Court also. It is not at all correct. I represent a party which is the ruling party in Madras. We also find some obstacles in the way of acquiring lands for public purposes. But we hold the view that we should not be hasty in bringing forward legislation in this manner and we should not give room for such legislation to be questioned again in the Supreme Court.

Here the hon. Minister has introduced a provision revalidating some of the notifications which have been declared *ultra vires* by the Supreme Court and struck down. In Madras we had a similar case in 1964, the famous Vajravelu Mudaliar case which was decided by the Supreme Court here. There the previous Government issued a notification under sec. 4 and then it waited for years together and then it passed the award in 1964 which was questioned by the Madras High Court. It was taken up again by the Madras Government and brought to the Supreme Court. Then the Supreme Court gave a judgment which is really worth noting. I say this because we should not give room for this Bill also facing the same difficulty in the Supreme Court again

There is a fundamental right given to owners of property and they will go to the court in order to uphold it. Recently there was a decision by the Supreme Court to the effect that Parliament has no right to pass any law abridging the fundamental rights guaranteed in Part III of the Constitution. In the face of that decision, here is a Bill which seeks to validate some of the notifications declared to be unjust by the Supreme Court. The case I referred to earlier, the Vajravelu Mudaliar case, is similar to the present one. This Bill concerns the judgment in the Madhya Pradesh case where a notification was issued in 1949 but final declaration was made in 1963 or 1964 after a gap of so many years. The same was the case in relation to the Madras case. There the Supreme Court has ruled like this:

> "If a law says that though a House is acquired, it shall be valued as a land or that though a house site is acquired it shall be valued as an agricultural land and that though it is acquired in 1960 its value in 1930 should be given, then the principle does not pertain to the domain of adequancy".

Also:

> "If the compensation is illusory or the principles prescribed are irrelevant to the value of the property at or about the time of its acquisition, it can be said that the legislature has committed a fraud on the power and therefore the law is bad".

Again they have stated:

> "When the court says that a particular legislation is colourable, it means the legislature has transgressed its legislative powers and in an overt or indirect manner it adopts a device to outstep the limits of its powers".

My humble submission is that the judgement given in the Vajravelu Mudaliar case by the Supreme Court clearly gives a loophole to impugn section 4 of this provision. The hon. Minister can very well say that the Government will have to face so many proceedings. As my hon. friend suggested, it is open to Government to notify afresh. We are not questioning the sovereignty of Parliament or denying the right of Government; it is open to Government, both at the Cetre and in the States, to notify afresh and then proceed in the manner suggested, but they should not validate a thing which has been adjudged unjust by the Sureme Court. So, in the light of that decision, this section 4 clearly abridges or takes away the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution. Hence, it must be referred to the Select Committee.

Secondly, in order to obviate difficulties, he has introduced a provision in clause 3 to add the following words:

> "and different declarations may be made from time to time in respect of different parcels. . ."

There is also a proviso:

> "Provided that, no declaration in respect of any particular land covered by a notification under Section 4, Sub-Section (1), published after the commencement of the Land Acquisition (Amendment and Validation) Ordinance, 1967, shall be made after the expiry of three years from the date of such publication:"

There is also a further proviso. My submission that the duration is really

(Shri V. Krishnamoorthi.)

too long, and I have therefore given amendment that the period should be reduced to one year and six months respectively.

If my house is to be acquired by the Government, I must get the market value of the previous day. If the Government want to acquire a company, it pays the market value of the shares on the previous day, but if the Government wants to acquire land it desires to pay compensation at the rate prevailing on the date of the preliminary notification, not that prevailing on the date of the final notification. Why? Today a piece of land may cost Rs. 1,000 in one locality, and within one year it may cost Rs. 10,000. Why should the Government deprive the right of the individual guaranteed under the Constitution? That is my objection. And the duration of time between the preliminary and final notifications should be shortened, in my submission, is it should not exceed more than six months in any case.

The Minister should not be in haste in proceeding with this Bill, because it will be challenged again in the Supreme Court, and once a writ is filed and a stay is granted, it takes another two or three years. So, it is not going to solve the problem, to serve the purpose the Minister has in view. So, we should not be hasty. We can very well pass this legislation after referring to the Select Committee, in the next session. Nothing will happen. The ordinance is there, which has got a life of another two or three months. So, my submission is that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee in order to overcome the difficulties pointed out by me and by other hon. Members of the Opposition.

श्री बसवन्त (भिवंडी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन के सामनें भूमि अधिग्रहण का जो बिल आया है, जो मेंरी राय इसके सम्बन्ध में है उसको में आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूं । मेरे अपने निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की जो कठिनाइयां हैं उनको ही मैं सदन के सामने रखना चाहूंगा । उन सब को देखते हुए यह अच्छा होगा कि भूमि अधिग्रहण बिल को रखने की अनुमति दी जायें या न दी जाए ।

पहले तो मैं यह बतलाना चाहता हूं कि भूमि अधिग्रहण तीन उद्देश्यों को लेकर किया जाता है । एक तो सरकार खुद अपने कामों के लिए जमीन लेती है । दूसर कोई नहर या पार्क बनवाना होता है तो उसके लिए भूमि का अधिग्रहण किया जाता है और सार्वजनिक उद्देश्य को लेकर कर ऐसा किया जाता है । तीसरे जब कम्पनियां बिठाने की बात होती तो एम० आई० डी० सी० के नाम के ऊपर उद्योग-पतियों को सस्ती भूमि देकर उन कम्पनियों को बिठाया जाता है ।

जहां तक पहली दो बातों का सम्बन्ध है, राष्ट्रीय भावना को ध्यान में रखते हुए यह ठीक मालूम पड़ता है कि भूमि का अधिग्रहण किया जाए और ऐसा करने के बाद भूमि के ठीक दाम चुकायें जायें । लेकिन जहां तक तीसरी बात का सम्बन्ध है, उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं अपने क्षेत्र के कुछ मामले आपके सामने रखूंगा तो अच्छा होगा

30 अगस्त, 1962 को इस सदन में भूमि अधिग्रहण बिल पर विचार हुआ था । मैंने उसी समय अपनी कुछ राय प्रकट की थी । उस समय पाटिल साहब कृषि मंत्री थे । उन्होंने बहुत प्रामिसिज किये थे । लेकिन मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि 1962 से लेकर 1967 तक उस कानून के अन्तर्गत किस तरह कार्यवाही की गई और उन प्रामि-सिज को किस हद तक पूरा किया गया ।

थाना डिस्ट्रिक्ट में बेलापुर पट्टी, आजदे गोलीवली, अम्बरनाथ मोरीवली, वांगणी, खारवाई और मानकीवली गांवों में कम से कम पच्चीस हजार एकड़ भूमि का अधिग्रहण किया गया । जब बेलापुर पट्टी में काम काम शुरू होने लगा, तो पार्लियामेंट का सदस्य होने के नाते मुझे भी बुलाया गया और मुझे कहा गया कि चूकि वहां पर फैक्टरी खड़ी करनी है, अच्छा काम हो रहा है, इसलिए मैं किसानों को कहूं कि वे नोटिस मिलने पर अपनी भूमि को कब्जे में दे दें, ताकि वहां पर काम शीघ्र ही शुरु कर दिया जाये ।

मुझे यह भी आश्वासन दिया गया कि फैक्टरी तैयार होने पर साठ फीसदी कर्मचारी वहां के लोगों में से रखे जायेंगे। 1962 के बाद क्या हुआ ? वहां पर आई० सी० आई० और मुकतलाल ग्रुप की फैक्टरियां खड़ी की गईं। उन फैक्टरियों में शुरू शुरू में कुछ आदमियों को रख लिया गया, लेकिन बाद में कहा गया कि वे आदमी हमारे काम के नहीं हैं और फैक्टरियों के पूरा होने पर उन को निकाल दिया गया। उन में दस परसेंट कर्मचारी भी वहां के लोगों में से नहीं रखे गए।

भूमि अधिग्रहण के समय एम० आई० डी० सी० ने यह बात तय की थी कि जब हम बीस हजार एकड़ जमीन ले रहे हैं, तो हम वहां पर एक इंडस्ट्रियल ट्रेनिंग सेंटर भी खोलेंगे और जिन किसानों की भूमि ली जायेगी, उन के लड़कों को भी हम शिक्षा देंगे और उन को फैक्टरी में काम पर भी लगायेंगे। लेकिन आखिर में क्या हुआ ? ट्रेनिंग सेंटर के लिए भूमि मुकर्रर की गई। जब तक बिल्डिंग नहीं बनी, तब तक के लिए एक शार्ट-टर्म कोर्स तैयार किया गया, और 60 विद्यार्थियों को छ महीने तक प्रशिक्षण दिया गया। उन में से अभी तक केवल दो को सर्विस में लिया गया है और बाकी के 58 बेकार घूम रहे हैं। जहां तक लांग-टर्म कोर्स का सम्बन्ध है, एम० आई० डी० सी० के सेक्रेटरी ने मुझे कहा कि हम ने एजूकेशन डिपार्टमेंट को कह दिया है कि इस सम्बन्ध में जो भूमि निश्चित की गई है, वहां पर आई० टी० आई० सेंटर खोल दिया जाये, जिस में उन लोगों को प्रशिक्षण दिया जाय। मैं समझता हूं कि ऐसे उपदेश देने से एजूकेशन डिपार्टमेंट काम नहीं करेगा। यह काम तो एम० आई० डी० सी० को स्वयं अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिए था, क्योंकि उसी ने इस का वादा किया था।

मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि भूमि के मिलने तक तो कई प्रकार के आश्वासन दिये जाते हैं कि हम यह करेंगे, वह करेंगे, लेकिन बाद में उन लोगों के साथ विश्वासघात किया जाता है और अगर मैं यह कहूं कि उन का गला घोंटा जाता है, तो कोई अनुचित बात नहीं होगी।

खरीवली और मानकोवली गांवों में 400 एकड़ भूमि के अधिग्रहण का प्रश्न था। सरकार की ओर से कहा गया कि किसान उस जमीन को वालन्टेरिली दे दें। सार्वजनिक कार्य करने वाले हम लोगों को वहां ले जाया गया और इस के परिणामस्वरूप वह जमीन सरकार को दे दी गई। बाद में हमें पता चला कि उस जमीन का दाम एक एकड़ अर्थात पांच हजार गज के लिए चार सौ रुपये के हिसाब से दिया गया, जबकि महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंन्ट ने दो साल पहले सचिवालय के सामने जो जमीन बेची, उस का दाम आठ हजार रुपये प्रति-गज के हिसाब से लिया। मैं कोई गलत या झूठ बात नहीं कह रहा हूं। मैं ने चीफ मिनिस्टर से अपील की कि इस जमीन का उचित मुआवजा दिया जाना चाहिए। चीफ मिनिस्टर ने 15-3-67 को मुझे एक खत लिखा, जो कि मराठी में है। उस खत में उन्होंने कहा, "या बाबतचे कागद पत्र मी पाहिले। विशेष भू-संपादन अधिकारयाने त्याचेसमोर आनेला सर्व पुरावा लक्षात घेऊनच नुकसान भरपाईची रक्कम जाहीर केलेली आहे असे दिसून येते"। इस का मतलब यह है कि सरकार का इस से ज्यादा मुआवजा देने का न तो विचार है और न ही वह दे सकती है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य इस का हिन्दी में तर्जूमा कर दें।

श्री बसवन्त : मैं ने मुख्य मंत्री को खत लिखा था कि उन लोगों को चार सौ रुपये गज प्रति-एकड़ के हिसाब से मुआवजा दिया जा रहा है वह बिल्कुल कम है और वह स्वयं इस मामले को देख लें। तीन महीने के बाद उन्होंने मुझे यह उत्तर दिया कि उन्होंने सारी बातें देख ली हैं और उन को ऐसा लगता है कि सरकार कानूनी तौर से इस से अधिक मुआवजा नहीं दे सकती है।

[श्री बसवन्त]

इस से बिल्कुल प्रत्यक्ष हो जाता है कि उद्योगपतियों के लिए सरकारी अधिकारियों के द्वारा जिन किसानों की भूमि ली जाती है, उन को पूरा दाम नहीं दिया जाता है। न तो उन को पूरा मुआवजा दिया जाता है और न ही सरकार का ऐसा विचार है। जो भूमि बम्बई के नजदीक है, स्टेशन और रोड के समीप हैं उसी को पहले एम० आई० डी० सी० के नाम से छीन लिया जाता है। उद्योगपति कहते हैं कि पहले उस जमीन को ले लिया जाये, चाहे वह जमीन कितनी अच्छी और उपजाऊ ही क्यों न हो। उद्योगपति ऊंची-नीची और दूर स्थित जगहो पर भूमि को लेने के लिए तैयार नहीं होते है।

मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हू कि भूमि-अर्जन के अन्तर्गत ऐसी कार्यवाहिया हो रही हैं, जिन से किसानों को बहुत हानि होती है। इस सम्बन्ध में जो आश्वासन दिये गए थे, उन को 1962 से ले कर आज तक पूरा नहीं किया गया है। मैं सदन से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हम लोग किसानो के वोटों से चुन कर यहां आए हैं। उद्योगपतियों के लिए, मफतलाल ग्रुप जैसे करोडपतियों के लिए दो तीन आने गज के हिसाब से किसानों से भूमि लेना अच्छी बात नही है। इसलिए इस प्रकार के भूमि अर्जन बिल को मान्यता देने में हम असमर्थ है।

जिन किसानों की भूमि चली जाती है वे और उन के लड़के तो कभी सर्विस नहीं करते हैं, उन को कोई जानकारी नही होती है। पहली मर्तबा उनको नौकरी में ले लिया जाता है लेकिन उन के छोड़ जाने के बाद और लोगों को भर्ती कर लिया जाता है। फैक्टरी में आठ दस हजार आदमी काम करने वाले होते हैं। यद्यपि बम्बई में प्राहिबिशन है लेकिन जिस को गांव की शराब कहते हैं, उस का धंधा किसानों के लड़कों के हाथ में आ जाता है।

मेरी प्रार्थना है कि सरकार की ओर से जो अभिवचन दिये गए हैं कृषि मंत्रालय को उन को पूरा करना चाहिए। जिन उद्योगपतियों के लिए भूमि ली जाती है उन के ऊपर इस प्रकार का कानूनी दायित्व डाला जाना चाहिए कि जिन किसानों की भूमि ली जाती है उन को सिखाने पढ़ाने, उन को प्रशिक्षण देने और उन को नौकरी पर लगाने की व्यवस्था करना जरूरी है न कि उनका गला घोटा जाए।

काग्रेस दल का सदस्य होते हुए भी मै इस बिल का विरोध करता हूं। आप ने मुझे जो समय दिया है उसके लिए मै आपका आभारी हूं।

श्री महाराज सिंह भारती (मेरठ) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आज पूरे देश में जो प्लानिंग चल रहा है उस का मतलब तो यह होना चाहिए कि देश के हर एक अंग का ध्यान रखा जायें और एक नियोजित ढंग से देश का विकास किया जाये। लेकिन जब सरकार को कोई नियोजन का हिसाब याद नही रहता है है और मुल्क अपने ही ढंग से बढ़ना शुरु होता है तब इस प्रकार की परेशानी होती है कि दिल्ली शहर इतना बढ़ ग-.ा है इस को और कहां तक तक बढ़ाया जाये और लोगों की जरूरतें कैसे पूरी की जाये। चौधरी ब्रह्म प्रकाश के यहां जमीन कम दिखाई देती हैं तो फिर चले जाते हैं मेरठ की तरफ। हम तो उन बदकिस्मत इन्सानों में से हैं जिन के कागज पर मालिक लखनऊ वाले हैं और मौके पर मालिक दिल्ली वाले हैं। लखनऊ वाले तो इसलिए हमारी उपेक्षा करते हैं कि हमारा सारा दूध, सब्जी और सब चीजे दिल्ली में जाती हैं और दिल्ली वाले इसलिए हमारी उपेक्षा करते हैं कि कागज पर दिल्ली से हमारा कोई वास्ता नहीं है।

हम तो उत्तर प्रदेश वाले हैं। जरूरत पड़ी बसने की, दिल्ली से हुक्म गया कि दिल्ली

के मास्टर प्लान में गाजियाबाद का मास्टर प्लान फिट कर दिया जाय। वह फिट कर दिया गया। 52 गांवों को हुक्म दिया गया कि 6 पैसे गज मआवजा मिलेगा, सरकार तुम्हारी जमीन ले रही है। मंत्री जी बैठे हुए हैं, राम सुभग सिंह जी भुक्तभोगी हैं, इन को बीच मे डाला गया था। दो सौ ढाई सौ किसान यहां आकर पार्लियामेन्ट को घेरे पड़े थे। डेढ़ दो महीने पड़े रहे। तब वह एक रुपये और दो रुपये गज तक आये थे और आज वही जमीन 50 रुपये गज मिल रही है।

19 hrs.

कहां शहर बसाये जायं, कैसे बसाये जायं, कहां बढ़ाये जायं, हमारे प्लानिंग के अन्दर कोई इस का हिसाब नहीं है। भूमि अर्जन करना है, भूमि लेना है, लेकिन यह कोई नहीं जानता कि शहरों के चारों तरफ की ही भूमि इस देश में सब से ज्यादा कीमती भूमि है जो सब्जी पैदा कर सकती है, कई फसल पैदा कर सकती है। उस से अच्छी भूमि कहीं नहीं होती। जब किसान 15-20 साल मरने पचने के बाद उस को बढ़िया बनाता है उस में अपने कुएं बैठाता है, उस को ठीक करता है, सब्जी पैदा करने लगता है, और जब गाजियाबाद की पैदा की हुई गोभी न सिर्फ दिल्ली वाले बल्कि कलकत्ता वाले भी खाने लगते हैं, तब उन से यह कहा जाता है कि हम को बंगला बनाने के लिए जमीन चाहिए और वही बढ़िया जमीन इस तरह धीरे धीरे चली जायेगी शहर के बढ़ने में। हमारी सरकार के नियोजन ने इस बात का ध्यान नहीं रखा कि शहरों का बढ़ाना रोक दिया जाय। पकी हुई जमीन पर शहर बसाये जायं। मौजूदा शहर न फैले। एक लाख को दस लाख मे न बदला जाय। नये सिरे से एक लाख बनाया जाय या कहीं दस हजार बीस हजार में बदल दिया जाया। पर इस तरह की चीज कोई नियोजन में है नहीं। नतीजा यह होता है कि मेरठ के लोग इस आप के बढ़ते हुए शहर के शिकार हो जाते हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may continue tomorrow.

19.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, April 6, 1967/Chaitra 16, 1889 (Saka).

GMGIPND—LS II—106 (Al) LS—6-5-67—970.